FOREIGN
BROADCAST
INFORMATION
SERVICE

Daily Report

Soviet Union

BIS-SOV-90-007
Wednesday
0 January 1990

Daily Report
Soviet Union

FBIS-SOV-90-007 — CONTENTS — 10 January 1990

ARMS CONTROL & DISARMAMENT

Inspection of 'Reforger 90' War Games Concludes *[TASS]* 1
'Reforger' Exercise Belies NATO Talk of Peace *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 4 Jan]* 1
Test Moratorium Possible If U.S. Alters Stance *[PRAVDA 9 Jan]* 2
Prospect of East-West Dialogue Examined *[Drobkov in PRAVDA 8 Jan]* 2

COMMUNIST RELATIONS

Continued Reportage on CEMA Meeting in Sofia 5
  Poles Cited on Disbandment *[IZVESTIYA 7 Jan]* 5
  Calfa Looks for Changes *[TASS]* 5
  Ryzhkov Addresses Session 9 Jan *[TASS]* 5
  'Text' of Ryzhkov Speech *[PRAVDA 10 Jan]* 6
  Ryzhkov Meets Romania's Roman *[Moscow Radio]* 11
  Further on Ryzhkov-Roman Talks *[TASS]* 11
  Ryzhkov Meets Cuba's Rodriguez *[TASS]* 11
  Hungary's Nemeth Meets Ryzhkov *[TASS]* 11
'New Pattern' of CEMA Cooperation Seen *[Moscow Radio]* 12
  Commentator Outlines Problems *[Malykin on Moscow International]* 12
Perestroyka Seen as Answer to CEMA Problems *[SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 5 Jan]* 13
CEMA Seen in Need of 'Radical Changes' *[Rodionov in IZVESTIYA 10 Jan]* 15
  'Radical Perestroyka' Required *[Averchenko in PRAVDA 9 Jan]* 16
Warsaw Pact Information Group Meets 9-10 Jan *[TASS]* 17

WORLDWIDE ISSUES

Gerasimov Gives Foreign Ministry Briefing 10 Jan 18
  Va'ezi Visit, Iraq Talks *[TASS]* 18
  Weizman Visit, Abe-Gorbachev Talks *[IZVESTIYA 10 Jan]* 18
Perez De Cuellar To Visit Moscow, Address Forum *[TASS]* 18
Prospects for Easing Cocom Restrictions Viewed *[IZVESTIYA 9 Jan]* 18
Internal Affairs Official on Joining Interpol *[Moscow Radio]* 19
New Year Prospects for East-West Ties Reviewed *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 7 Jan]* 20

INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

United States & Canada

U.S. Role in Nuclear Detection at Sea Urged *[IZVESTIYA 7 Jan]* 22
State Department Statement on Angola Criticized *[TASS]* 22

Northeast Asia

U.S. Envoy to S. Korea Cited on Troop Cuts *[TASS]* 23

Near East & South Asia

Shevardnadze, Iran's Va'ezi Discuss Nakhichevan *[TASS]* 23
  IRNA Report 24
Israel's Weizman To Meet With Shevardnadze *[Jerusalem Radio]* 24
Sharayev-Led CPSU Delegation Departs for Syria *[PRAVDA 9 Jan]* 24

Sub-Saharan Africa

Envoy Cited on 'Military Specialists' in Angola *[Dakar PANA]* 24

East Europe

Shevardnadze Interviewed on Visit to Romania *[IZVESTIYA 9 Jan]* 24
Romania Announces Foreign Policy 'Turning Point' *[SELSKAYA ZHIZN 9 Jan]* 26
Romanian Envoy Departs, Replacement Appointed *[IZVESTIYA 9 Jan]* 26
    New Ambassador *[Bucharest Radio]* 26
Rakowski Sees Need for 'Strong Left-Wing Party' *[PRAVDA 5 Jan]* 27
Shevardnadze, Poland's Skubiszewski Exchange Cables *[IZVESTIYA 6 Jan]* 27
Aboimov, Polish Ambassador Discuss Cooperation *[IZVESTIYA 28 Dec]* 27
Polish Spokesman Outlines Foreign Policy *[TASS]* 27
Briefing Views Poland's European, Bloc Ties *[IZVESTIYA 7 Jan]* 28
SED-PDS Organizational Restructuring Examined *[PRAVDA 9 Jan]* 28
SED-PDS' Gysi Seeks 'Single Peaceful Europe' *[PRAVDA 9 Jan]* 28
TASS Notes Growth of Neo-Nazism in GDR 29
CPCZ Holds First Plenum Since Shakeup *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 9 Jan]* 29
CSSR's Havel Sends Thanks for Message *[IZVESTIYA 6 Jan]* 29
Ryzhkov Meets With Bulgaria's Mladenov *[TASS]* 30
Bulgarian Demonstrations Legacy of Zhivkov Era *[IZVESTIYA 7 Jan]* 30
Bulgarian Decision Leads to Ethnic Unrest *[PRAVDA 7 Jan]* 31
MSZMP's Thurmer Sends Thanks to Gorbachev *[Moscow Radio]* 32

West Europe

Azerbaijan Delegation Meets Turkish President *[TASS]* 32
Govorov Briefs France's Joxe on Civil Defense *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 28 Dec]* 32
Belgium Sets 'Example' With Military Cuts *[PRAVDA 4 Jan]* 32
Italian CP Issues Major Reform Document *[PRAVDA 6 Jan]* 32
Spanish Trade Contract 'Blocked' by U.S. *[PRAVDA 28 Dec]* 33

Latin America & Caribbean

Panama President Meets Opposition Figures *[TASS]* 33

NATIONAL AFFAIRS

Congress of People's Deputies

14 Dec Session Speeches, Proceedings Reported 34
    On Stages of Economic Reform *[IZVESTIYA 16 Dec]* 34
    On 13th 5-Year Plan *[IZVESTIYA 16 Dec]* 40
    More on Stages of Economic Reform *[IZVESTIYA 17 Dec]* 44
    More on 13th 5-Year Plan *[IZVESTIYA 17 Dec]* 46
Deputies Interviewed on Congress Results *[ARGUMENTY I FAKTY No 52]* 52

Political & Social

Medvedev: CPSU Central Committee Meeting Set *[Moscow International]* 54
Yakovlev Sees Lithuania Lacking 'Complete Picture' *[Moscow International]* 54
Lithuanian Communist Wants Calm Gorbachev Visit *[AFP]* 55
Sajudis Prepares for Gorbachev Visit to Lithuania 56
    Rallies Organized for Visit *[Vilnius International]* 56
    Leader Outlines Demands *[Vilnius Radio]* 56
    News Conference *[Vilnius Radio]* 56

Siauliai Rally To Support Sajudis Decision *[Vilnius Radio]* 57
CPSU Delegation Continues Lithuanian Visit *[TASS]* 57
    Lithuanian Party Official on Visit *[Vilnius Radio]* 57
    Maslyukov Visits Ignalina AES *[Moscow TV]* 58
    Medvedev Questions Independence *[Moscow TV]* 58
    Further Activities *[Moscow Radio]* 59
    Medvedev, Maslyukov Hold Meetings *[TASS]* 59
    More Details of Visit, Talks *[IZVESTIYA 10 Jan]* 60
Yazov Meets With Lithuanian Deputies 13 Dec *[TIESA 15 Dec]* 61
Lithuanian Supreme Soviet To Meet 15 Jan *[Vilnius Radio]* 65
    Agenda Noted *[Vilnius International]* 65
Girenko, Nishanov Attend Azerbaijan Aktivs Meeting *[Baku Radio]* 65
    Comment on Nagorno-Karabakh *[Moscow TV]* 65
Foreign Ministry Group Visits Azerbaijan *[Baku Radio]* 66
Nakhichevan Border Remains 'Conflict Zone' *[IZVESTIYA 9 Jan]* 66
    Authorities Controlling Situation *[TASS]* 67
    Newspaper Details Situation *[SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 9 Jan]* 68
Tehran Radio Reports on Azerbaijan Gatherings *[Tehran International]* 69
Continuing 'Tense' Situation in NKAO Detailed 69
    Azerbaijan Papers Report *[Baku Radio]* 69
    Correspondents Describe Situation *[Moscow Radio]* 69
Armenian Radio: Azerbaijan Motivated by Pan-Turkism *[Yerevan International]* 70
NKAO Cultural Groups Withdraw From Ministry *[Yerevan International]* 70
Armenian Supreme Soviet Discusses NKAO *[Moscow Radio]* 71
Armenian, NKAO Communists Seek Affiliation *[Yerevan KOMMUNIST 16 Dec]* 71
Single Committee To Handle Armenian Repatriates *[Yerevan Radio]* 71
Armenian Culture Society Founded in Kiev *[TASS]* 72
Latvia Faced With Financial, Economic Problems *[IZVESTIYA 6 Jan]* 72
Russian Orthodox Priest Reportedly Killed in Lvov *[Vienna DER STANDARD]* 72
IZVESTIYA Interviews New Turkmen Premier *[7 Jan]* 73
Spread of Gun Ownership in Kirghizia Viewed *[KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA 9 Jan]* 73
Soviet Germans' Hold Rally in Alma-Ata *[IZVESTIYA 9 Jan]* 74
Supreme Soviet Committees Resume Work *[Moscow TV]* 74
Resignations Seen as CPSU 'Purification' *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 6 Jan]* 74
CPSU Secretary Stroyev Tours Pskov, Novgorod *[PRAVDA 8 Jan]* 76
Theorists Debate Social Democratic Contribution *[PRAVDA 5 Jan]* 77
RSFSR Supreme Court on Sentencing Policy *[SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 5 Jan]* 77
Leningrad Soviets Discuss Food, Supply Problem *[Moscow Radio]* 77
Scientific Cleanup Center Set Up Near Chernobyl *[TASS]* 77
Chernobyl Victims Get Privilege Facilities *[IZVESTIYA 8 Jan]* 78
Vlasov Views Kaliningrad Economic Autonomy *[IZVESTIYA 8 Jan]* 78
Government Views Mining Region's Development *[PRAVDA 4 Jan]* 79
Consumer Goods Output to Rise By R66 Billion *[Moscow International]* 80
Vorotnikov Launches TV Program for RSFSR *[SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 7 Jan]* 80
Journalists Reminded of 'Moral' Demands *[PRAVDA 6 Jan]* 82
PRAVDA Reviews KOMMUNIST January Issue *[4 Jan]* 83
New Weekly Business Newspaper Published *[Moscow TV]* 83

Economic

Government Securities Program Detailed *[IZVESTIYA 4 Jan]* 83
Short-Term Economic Recovery Measures Outlined *[IZVESTIYA 9 Jan]* 84
Export Goods Requiring License Listed *[IZVESTIYA 28 Dec]* 85
Retail Gold Prices To Increase 50 Percent *[KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA 9 Jan]* 86
Aviation News Conference Views Future Plans *[Kozmin on TASS]* 86
Cost, Access to Abolished Medical Unit Viewed *[ARGUMENTY I FAKTY No 48]* 86
Economic Aspects of Ship Scrapping Discussed *[PRAVDA 9 Jan]* 88
Railway Problems Affect Cities' Drinking Water *[Helsinki Radio]* 89
Boost in Economy Called for in 'Crucial Year' *[PRAVDA 5 Jan]* 89

Scientific

Cosmonauts Complete Eighth Scheduled Space Walk 89
    Program Outlined *[Moscow Radio]* 89
    8 Jan Space Walk Described *[Moscow International]* 90
    Delay Due to Faulty Valve Explained *[Moscow TV]* 90
Austrian Spaceflight Candidates Begin Training *[TASS]* 91

Inspection of 'Reforger 90' War Games Concludes

LD0801181390 Moscow TASS in English 1743 GMT 8 Jan 90

[Text] Brussels January 8 TASS - By TASS correspondent Valeriy Shashkov:

Under the provisions of the documents of the Stockholm Conference on Confidence-Building and Security and Disarmament in Europe, a team of Soviet military inspectors has inspected military activity on Belgian territory in connection with the large-scale "Reforger 90" war games on since late December.

During the games which will last till mid-January, U.S. troops will be airlifted from continental United States to Western Europe to handle an imagined crisis situation in Europe. Many of the 15,400 soldiers and officers taking part in the exercises and large quantities of military equipment are being delivered via maritime and sea routes through Belgian territory.

As the rules stipulate, the inspection took precisely 48 hours, Lieutenant Colonel R.A. Yepifanov, the inspection team's senior officer, told TASS before flying home. It is too early to talk about findings, since the data collected need to be processed.

It may be pointed out, however, Yepifanov said, that the Belgian side has done everything to permit us to discharge our task successfully, placing at the team's disposal helicopters and motor vehicles and handling all problems—which are inevitable in so complex an undertaking—in a helpful and friendly way.

Seeing the Soviet inspectors off at the Melsbroek military airfield, Colonel Knott, spokesman for the Belgian General Staff, said their presence at the manoeuvres is best evidence of improved East-West relations and of detente.

He said he was confident that the verifications provided for under the Stockholm document contribute to greater trust and security on the continent of Europe.

This is already a second inspection held on Belgian territory by representatives of one of the Warsaw Treaty Organisation countries. Last September a group of East German officers inspected manoeuvres involving the airlifting of British troops to the Federal Republic of Germany.

'Reforger' Exercise Belies NATO Talk of Peace

PM0801125990 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 4 Jan 90 First Edition p 3

[Colonel M. Ponomarev "Observer's Column": "'Reforger' Again"]

[Text] News agencies have reported that General J. Galvin, NATO supreme allied commander in Europe, has arrived in the Belgian port of Antwerp. This fact in itself does not merit special attention. Galvin gets about a bit. In this case, however, the general's arrival in Belgium was connected with a ceremony to greet the U.S. warship "Altair," which was delivering equipment for the U.S. troops, who, at the end of January, will participate in the NATO maneuvers code-named "Reforger."

Such maneuvers are designed to rehearse the transfer of troop formations and units from U.S. territory to Europe. These maneuvers are designed to rehearse the reinforcement of NATO forces, primarily in central Europe, "in the event of a crisis." Similar maneuvers have been conducted repeatedly in the past. But until last year they were, as a rule, a constituent part of the series of large-scale maneuvers by NATO armed forces under the overall title of "Autumn Forge." The world public repeatedly voiced its indignation at those militarist actions.

This could not fail to be taken into account in the NATO staffs. And so it was announced with great pomp there that "Autumn Forge 89" had a smaller number of participants and was more local in nature than all the previous ones.

In reality the Atlanticists did not undertake such a very crafty stunt. At the time they placed the "Reforger" maneuvers outside the entire "Autumn Forge" series. But they certainly did not abandon them. They were simply deferred—from September 1989 until January 1990. This is essentially the same rearrangement of components as is sometimes resorted to in arithmetic. As is known, the total does not change as a result.

Obviously, even Gen Galvin senses the ticklishness of the situation that has been created and the inappropriateness of the bloc's militarist actions under modern conditions. Addressing journalists in Antwerp, he admitted that the situation in the world has changed and the North Atlantic alliance is not now under such a threat from the Warsaw Pact as previously. But then, patently contradicting himself, the supreme commander in chief declared that, despite the easing of tension in East-West relations, the NATO allies "still need strong defenses." True, this time he was referring not to the military threat from the Warsaw Pact but to the unpredictable nature of the processes in East Europe. This unpredictability, he emphasized, demands that "everything possible be done to keep our powder dry."

A strange statement, to say the least. For everyone knows that a vigorous process of renewal and democratization is taking place in the states of East Europe. The "Iron Curtain" has collapsed, and the old stereotypes in politics are being eradicated. A major unilateral reduction of armed forces and arms is being implemented. Even greatly stretching a point, all this can hardly be imagined as posing a danger to the West.

Nevertheless, the "Reforger" maneuvers will take place. It is planned to transfer 15,000 U.S. servicemen to Europe from the United States on the basis of the so-called "forward basing strategy." But the matter will not be confined to this. In all, it is proposed to mobilize in the maneuvers almost 60,000 soldiers and officers of a number of NATO countries' armed forces, as well as 12,000 auxiliary personnel. To be fair, it should be pointed out that this is somewhat fewer than participated in the previous years' versions of "Reforger." But 60,000-70,000 is quite a lot too. Therefore protests are already being heard once again from the West European public. It is concerned at the inappropriateness of the maneuvers, as well as their high cost and the great damage that they cause.

As for the damage, that is their worry, as it were. We must be concerned about something else. The vigorous activity of the armed forces of the United States and other North Atlantic bloc states clearly contradicts numerous recent statements by the NATO military-political leadership on this alliance's devotion to the cause of strengthening peace and world security and on the defensive nature of its military doctrine. Is it not time to bring actions into line with words?

Test Moratorium Possible If U.S. Alters Stance

PM0901151990 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian
9 Jan 90 Second Edition p 7

[Konstantin Sorokin "Viewpoint": "Are Explosions to Ring Out?"]

[Text] A Western journalist once noted that glasnost, like ripples of water, constantly spreads and conquers more and more previously closed spheres. Indeed, just a few years ago the publication of official reports on nuclear tests in our country seemed a symbol of openness. But now, not only is the location of the Soviet nuclear test range widely known, a number of speakers have spoken openly at the Congresses of USSR People's Deputies and at the Supreme Soviet session about problems linked with the existence and functioning of the Semipalatinsk Test Range. This was possibly the first time in our history that an appropriate question from deputies was put to the Defense Ministry and received an official answer.

However, neither this answer nor the debate within the supreme organs of state power were able to smooth over the existing disagreements. The only thing that does not provoke particular objections is the actual existence of the "test range question," and not only in the West, but also in our country. This is not surprising since common human values go hand in hand with common human problems, notably in the sphere of arms and disarmament. Test range problems are particularly clear and universal. They are above all associated with ensuring physical safety. It is now well known that there are problems near Semipalatinsk. Thus the press reported releases of radioactive inert gases from an underground mine in February 1989. But such leaks happen quite regularly, for instance, in Nevada. More serious things also occur often there: a failure of safety equipment resulting in damage to electronic equipment costing $70 million; and the formation of a cave-in 10 meters deep above the site of the explosion, injuring 15 people. Mururoa Atoll in the Pacific Ocean, where France tests its nuclear weapons, is renowned for the fact that cracks have formed in its base through which the water is being contaminated, according to some specialists.

These examples by no means have been cited merely to say: The situation is better in our country than in theirs. The point lies elsewhere. Military activity, particularly "at the leading edge" of military-technical progress, does not take place without making its mark on people, the economy, and the natural environment of all states, irrespective of their system and membership of a particular alliance.

There are, of course, other common problems. They include the exclusion of vast territories from economic activity. And quite natural social and psychological tension in areas adjoining the test ranges. Ultimately nuclear tests and the presence of the test ranges stimulate the continuation of the nuclear race.

Logic suggests that common problems must be solved together. The introduction of a multilateral moratorium on nuclear explosions and a complete ban of them in the future would be the most radical solution. The USSR has been proposing this approach for many years. Unfortunately, the United States has cleaved to another viewpoint for just as many years: While U.S. strategy rests on nuclear deterrent forces, the United States claims it must continue tests to maintain the reliability and sophistication of these forces. London and Paris voice their own reservations.

In other words, the prospect of an agreed solution to the problem of nuclear tests and, consequently, of nuclear test ranges is still vague. Can public concern be "relieved" by moving test ranges elsewhere? I think not, since similar complications also will arise there. What if a unilateral moratorium is introduced on nuclear explosions once again? Obviously, that is not the way out either. Not so long ago the Soviet test range was silent for 18 months. Washington did not follow our example then. Unfortunately, there are not yet any real grounds for thinking that the situation would be any different this time.

It would be another matter if the United States was to change its approach on the question of nuclear tests. Then a moratorium and the multilateral ban on nuclear explosions would prove quite feasible. Then there would be no need to take steps aimed at enhancing the safety of test ranges or creating centers to study the effect of the tests on man and nature. The fundamental solution of the "test range problem" lies elsewhere—in the closure of all test ranges forever. That solution would be a highly important step forward in the efforts to create a nuclear-free and nonviolent world.

Prospect of East-West Dialogue Examined

PM0901123090 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian
8 Jan 90 Second Edition p 6

[Vladislav Drobkov article under the rubric "The View From Moscow": "From Confrontation to Dialogue"]

[Text] The year 1989, now gone forever, was rightly called the "year of Europe" and the last year of the "cold war." It was in Europe last year that the dramatic changes, the truly epochal developments, took place, giving us grounds to hope for the possibility of a genuinely peaceful period in international relations. A period whose key content would be a general consensus among different states on the impossibility of resolving the problems that exist between them by force of arms.

And it is deeply symbolic, in my view, that one of 1990's first news items was the Soviet Defense Ministry's announcement that last year the destruction of Soviet and U.S. shorter-range nuclear missiles deployed in Europe was fully completed. By 31 December 1989 a total of 1,498 Soviet and 451 U.S. intermediate- and shorter-range nuclear missiles had been destroyed.

Very promising breaches were thus made in the missile palisade that divides Western and Eastern Europe. Although as yet only an insignificant proportion of the lethal stockpiles has been removed from the vast nuclear powder keg that was sited on the continent in the "cold war" years, this news cannot but please us. It shows that it is possible in practice for Europe to make the transition from the arms buildup to coordinated arms reduction.

Furthermore the continuing destruction of the sophisticated missiles that both sides were only recently deploying offers hope that it will prove possible to reach agreement on reducing other types of armaments too. That, at the same time as building the common European home, we can clear away the "relics" of the past that litter the ground around it. Also, it is highly noteworthy that such assessments are now being made by many authoritative statesmen in Western Europe. As FRG Foreign Minister Hans-Dietrich Genscher stated a couple of days ago, "if the wall of stones is now collapsing, the other walls should be removed too: of missiles, tanks, and guns." It is, of course, a pity that the peoples of both East and West once paid so dearly for the erection of these "walls."

Europe is not only ridding itself of missiles that have proved unnecessary. The Soviet Union and a number of other socialist countries have begun a substantial reduction in their armed force and conventional arsenals. Suffice it to recall that our country alone is currently unilaterally disbanding troops that are equal in number to the West German Bundeswehr. And, as you know, the Bundeswehr is considered NATO's main strike force in Europe. The GDR, Hungary, Poland, and Czechoslovakia have started reducing their own armies.

The Warsaw Pact countries have already proclaimed the exclusively defensive nature of their military doctrine. Since the Bucharest Political Consultative Committee conference, work to transform the Warsaw Pact from a military-political organization into a politico-military organization has nearly been completed. In this context it is highly characteristic that despite the—in some cases very dramatic—change of leadership in a number of East European countries, they are all reaffirming their loyalty to allied commitments. This naturally does not rule out the possibility of each country's formulating its own views on the prospects for the development of the military-political situation in Europe and the pace and form of evolution within the Warsaw Pact. But there is, it seems to me, a general awareness that this evolution can be carried out most successfully on a multilateral basis, taking into account the realities that now exist in Europe, within the framework of the Helsinki process. That is the guarantee of the preservation of stability on the European continent and the continuation of the favorable changes taking place here.

It is no secret that the NATO states have yet to take equally impressive steps to reduce their own military potential. Although some signs of readiness for such reductions have now appeared. Thus, calls for a reduction in the U.S. military presence in Europe are heard increasingly persistently in the U.S. Congress. The other day C. Levine, a member of the Senate Armed Services Committee, came out in favor of a significant reduction in U.S. troops stationed on the territory of Washington's European NATO allies. That is also the view of S. Nunn, the committee's chairman. Plans for reducing the Bundeswehr's strength are being discussed in the FRG. Belgium, which intends to reduce its military spending, is in favor of withdrawing some of its troops from the bloc allies' territory.

As for the prospect of lowering the levels of military confrontation in Europe, it is a particularly encouraging fact that at the current Vienna talks on limiting conventional arms on the territory from the Atlantic to the Urals, there has been a rapprochement between the sides' positions. There is now a real prospect of the Vienna talks being completed this year. It was no accident that at the meeting off the shores of Malta M.S. Gorbachev and G. Bush declared their determination to help accelerate these talks. The visit to the Brussels headquarters of NATO by the Soviet foreign minister—in itself an unprecedented event—showed clearly that people in the North Atlantic bloc also are thinking about restructuring their organization, with an emphasis on the political aspect. The view was reaffirmed that at the present stage in Europe's development, the Warsaw Pact and NATO could play a stabilizing role. Naturally this in no way diminishes our readiness in future to work toward the joint elimination of these two groupings. The Soviet Union and the other Warsaw Pact countries have repeatedly declared the desire to put an end to the division of Europe into opposing military-political alliances. And this noble goal will be achieved in time.

But while NATO and the Warsaw Pact continue to exist, the most important task, it seems to me, is to establish a direct, truly open, equal, and constructive dialogue between them. E.A. Shevardnadze's visit to Brussels has basically already marked a significant step toward setting up this dialogue. The next stage could be the opening of a seminar on military doctrines, due to take place in Vienna soon. It will allow representatives of the armed forces of the East and West of Europe to become more closely acquainted with strategic and tactical principles and different aspects of the military policy of their countries, and will help to strengthen the climate of confidence on the continent. Let me observe that not so long ago such a meeting of prominent Warsaw Pact and NATO military leaders would have been inconceivable. But the changes that are taking place so rapidly in Europe today are gradually teaching us not to be particularly surprised even at what appeared unrealistic according to the old yardsticks. So I will not be surprised if, in time, political and military representatives of the Warsaw Pact are invited to sessions of various NATO organs, and vice versa. After all, even now foreign observers are invited to the two blocs' military maneuvers. Incidentally, the other day even General J. Galvin, NATO supreme commander, opening the "Reforger" maneuvers, was forced to admit that the possibility of a threat from the Warsaw Pact has declined markedly. The same conclusion was reached by many NATO war ministers, who were polled on the eve of the New Year by the magazine JANE'S DEFENSE WEEKLY. According to Netherlands Defense Minister Ter Beek, now that the era of the "cold war" is behind us, the task is to create new political relations which would justify a significant reduction in the quantity of arms.

Well, one can certainly agree with that view. In Europe, the time has come for military confrontation finally and irreversibly to give way to political dialogue.

Continued Reportage on CEMA Meeting in Sofia

Poles Cited on Disbandment

PM0901152990 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 7 Jan 90 Morning Edition p 1

[From TASS, REUTER, UPI roundup: "Debate Over CEMA"]

[Text] M. Swiecicki, Polish minister of foreign economic cooperation, has said that a new, more flexible organization must replace CEMA to help the 10 CEMA states create a market economy and facilitate their integration with the West European and world economies. Shortly before this M. Nezabitowska, the Polish Government press spokesman, announced that Poland was surprised at the proposal to disband CEMA submitted by CSSR Finance Minister V. Klaus following talks in Warsaw. She stressed that the CEMA structure must undergo substantial changes, but Poland has no intention at present of submitting an initiative regarding the disbandment of this organization. In turn V. Klaus said in Prague that he "was not talking about CEMA's immediate disbandment, but it is clear that the organization cannot exist in its present form."

Calfa Looks for Changes

LD0801211690 Moscow TASS in English 2101 GMT 8 Jan 90

[Text] Prague January 8 TASS—Before taking a plane to Sofia, Chairman of the Czechoslovak Government, head of the Czechoslovak delegation Marian Calfa told reporters that the Czechoslovak Government does not and will not propose to disband the Council for Mutual Economic Assistance.

"At the same time, we take along to Sofia a number of fundamental proposals aimed at changing the council's functions and activity," he said.

The chairman of the Czechoslovak Government said that the political situation in Czechoslovakia altered. The country is open with regard to other economies. All this should be reflected in the activity of CMEA and in Czechoslovakia's participation in this activity.

"CMEA in its present form does not suit our requirements," he said. "Therefore we want to propose such changes as would make the organisation an open one and would enable all CMEA member-countries to get involved in the world economy," he said.

"At the same time we will propose that the granting of credits be reviewed. The previous system bore the imprint of ideology. And we just want that the money of our working people be allocated to what is of advantage both to creditors and those who take the credits. In a word, we wish to propose fundamental changes in the CMEA statute," Calfa said.

The Soviet Union, on its part, proposed negotiations about the use of freely convertible curency at world prices in mutual payments, Calfa said.

He said this proposal fundamentally alters the nature of cooperation, which is in principle of advantage to Czechoslovakia. It suits Czechoslovakia's striving to get involved in the world economy and will be promoting this process.

It will naturally be necessary to decide if the settlement of accounts for oil and gas can be made in hard currency. This involves a huge volume of deliveries and consequently huge expenditures.

Therefore it should be borne in mind what consequences for the Czechoslovak State such settling of accounts may entail.

Calfa said the Czechoslovak delegation takes along to Bulgaria proposals for fundamental restructuring of the CMEA activity and for turning CMEA into a contemporary economic organisation.

Ryzhkov Addresses Session 9 Jan

LD0901182690 Moscow TASS in English 1807 GMT 9 Jan 90

[Excerpt] Sofia January 9 TASS—Restructuring will top the agenda of the 45th session of the Council for Mutual Economic Assistance (CMEA) which opened in Sofia today.

The session is being attended by the delegations from Bulgaria, Hungary, Vietnam, the German Democratic Republic, Cuba, Mongolia, Poland, Romania, the Soviet Union and Czechoslovakia. The Soviet delegation is led by Prime Minister Nikolay Ryzhkov.

The participants in the two-day session will discuss a broad range of tasks of further development of cooperation within the CMEA framework. Principal attention will be paid to the fundamental restructuring of the mechanism of multilateral interaction and associated legal and organisational matters, monetary-financial and credit relations, as well as price formation.

The session also will discuss the realisation of the comprehensive programme of scientific-technological progress of the CMEA member-countries up to the year 2000, coordination of national economic plans for the coming period, intensification of the social orientation of the multilateral cooperation.

Head of the Soviet delegation Ryzhkov made a speech at the session today. He dwelt on the Soviet leadership's principled assessment of the current historical changes. [passage omitted]

'Text' of Ryzhkov Speech

*PM1001110990 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian
10 Jan 90 Second Edition p 2*

["Text" of speech by N.I. Ryzhkov, chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers, under the rubric "At 45th CEMA Session," entitled "CEMA: On the Verge of Great Changes"]

[Text] Below follows the full text of the speech by Nikolay Ryzhkov to the 45th CEMA session. He said:

The unusual situation and the crucial nature of the moment obligates us to approach the questions which are being discussed at the present session from positions that are new in principle.

The CEMA countries are going through a complex period of deep socioeconomic and political reforms. The grave economic situation which in some cases has developed into a crisis and the changes which are taking place in the arrangement of political forces are sometimes viewed in certain circles in the West, and indeed in our own countries, too, as the collapse of socialism, as evidence of the insolvency of socialist ideals. Discussion on this question, the importance of which is genuinely common to the whole of mankind, is only just beginning and the decisive word belongs to history.

Therefore, let me confine myself to an exposition of the Soviet leadership's assessment in principle of the historic changes that are taking place, insofar as this is also linked to our approach to the issues being discussed by the session. It consists in the fact that a new modern concept of socialism as a society capable of self-renewal and possessing an effective and dynamic economy is making its way in the world today, overcoming great difficulties and deformations. The characteristics of this society are: real rather than declared sovereignty of the people; high level morals and culture; and orientation toward the all-round development of the genuinely free person. In the course of these transformations socialist society is emerging from a state of isolation and making the transition to openness and wide cooperation with the outside world. Overcoming the inertia of the models that came into being earlier in our countries and replacing them with ones that are new in principle is an immutable condition for achieving these objectives.

The progress of perestroyka in the USSR has shown up the entire complexity of this task. What is required is not only the most radical and all-embracing reform of the economic mechanism, but the structural perestroyka of the economy's material and technical base itself. Moreover, in the conditions that have arisen in the USSR, and indeed not just in our country, the resolution of economic and social problems cannot be ensured without implementing a radical reform of the political system. The First and Second Congresses of USSR People's Deputies, which took place in the summer and at the end of last year, indicate how acute these problems are, how urgent they have become, and how the political and social and economic processes are altering. The congresses have shown the whole depth and irreversible nature of the processes of perestroyka, the increasingly active involvement in them of the broad strata of the public and the real particpation of the working people in making political decisions. Essentially a new political model, founded upon the sovereignty of the people, placing all spheres of public life under the control of the people and strengthening the foundations of the socialist system is now being formed in the USSR.

It is quite natural that such deep changes in the life of Soviet society cannot fail to affect economic relations with CEMA countries too. Cooperation and perestroyka, cooperation and economic reform—these are interconnected issues. Reflecting the process of democratization and decentralization in the economy and changing radically the legal position of the production collectives, the reform also presents us with the necessity of finding adequate forms of economic interaction capable of removing the obstacles that are slowing down and, in a number of instances, blocking the development of our trading and economic links.

It should be stressed absolutely and categorically that under the conditions of the reform, and under the conditions of the revolutionary changes which are taking place in the CEMA countries, the USSR is not changing its attitude in principle to CEMA, viewing it as a mutually useful collective body of economic cooperation.

For the USSR, as indeed for the other CEMA member states, it is of no mean importance that our collective organization unites countries between which stable and vitally necessary economic ties exist. The majority of these countries, being situated in one spatial and economic region, are able to derive considerable advantages from their territorial proximity. For countries that are economically complementary to each other to such a high degree it would be absurd to underestimate the positive role of their collective organization, within the framework of which a number of common conditions, standards, and norms of cooperation operate, and an exchange of information on topical issues of development and economic policy takes place.

It would not be difficult to give evidence of the practical value of CEMA since in the past, despite all its shortcomings, it has for several postwar decades fulfilled the role of an organizational center which has furthered the uniting of our efforts and the emergence onto a new level of economic development both of each of the socialist countries individually and of the entire community as a whole. It has made possible the realization of important scientific, technical and economic projects in power generation, in the oil and gas and ore extraction industry, and in the development of production through cooperation in a number of branches of machine-building.

On the basis of principles that have been coordinated in CEMA and forms of cooperation that have been worked out collectively, our countries have had the opportunity to make better provision for their requirements of fuel and raw materials, machines and equipment, food, and consumer goods.

Nor can we fail to take account of the fact that even in its present stage CEMA helps to involve all our countries and each one of them individually more deeply in world economic relations and eases their adaptation to the requirements of world markets. It is not fortuitous that West European countries are showing growing interest in our organization and this has found expession in the signing of the declaration on establishing official relations between CEMA and the EEC. However, over the past few years we expressed, ever more frequently, our dissatisfaction with the state of affairs within CEMA: its inability to find adequate solutions to questions that have come to a head, its negligible influence on the economic development of countries and upon their mutual cooperation.

The mechanism of our economic relations, which took shape in the period of extensive development, was in keeping with the centralized, administrative-distributive system of management. It ruled out the formation of market relations, replacing them by direct commodity exchange, regulated at state level. This deprived enterprises of incentives to get involved in foreign economic ties, barred our way toward forming a united socialist market, impeded the raising of the technical level and quality of output and became a brake on technical progress.

During the latest session the question of the need for new approaches toward the problems that have arisen was discussed and a decision was made to work out an integral concept to perfect the mechanism of cooperation and the activities of CEMA. We have begun this work, but are dissatisfied with its results. It was not possible to complete in the council's bodies the preparation of agreed proposals to restructure the mechanism of cooperation. This was noted in the session's draft decision.

In the meantime, restructuring the economic mechanism of cooperation and, in essence, also the whole system of economic relations among the CEMA countries is no longer a question that determines the long-term prospects for mutual economic ties. It has now acquired urgency, since the solving of a number of most topical problems of trade and economic relations among CEMA countries and, in the final analysis, the destiny of the council itself, depend upon it. Therefore, allow me to voice some considerations of principle pertaining to possible ways and directions of the restructuring of the system of our economic relations, as they are seen by the USSR at present.

In the past few years the development of economic ties between the CEMA countries lost its dynamism, and their role in solving economic and social problems has weakened. The effectiveness of economic cooperation declined. Ever more tangible impediments began to hinder the growth of mutual trade, expanding the exchange of output from the processing and machine-building industries, and deepening industrial coproduction. The force of attractiveness of cooperation diminished. Most countries came up against a decline in competitiveness in the foreign markets, a lowering of their share in the world commodity turnover and a growth in external indebtedness.

We all understand that the causes of these negative phenomena are rather complex and are determined by a whole range of internal and external factors alike. However, it is impossible not to see the main thing: A deep disparity which influences the mutual economic ties in an ever more tangibly negative way has arisen between the system of interstate economic ties itself and the economic reforms underway in a majority of the CEMA countries. In fact it makes us face this choice: Either we are to retain the existing foreign economic mechanism, but we renounce the continuation of reforms, or else we are to carry out a radical restructuring of this mechanism, having made it compatible with the economic reforms being implemented in our countries. It is sufficient to phrase the question like this to arrive at the conclusion that there can be only one solution. Economic reforms, moving away from the directive-distributive system of running the economy and embracing the economic methods represent a historic necessity for our countries. Renouncing the reform would, in the USSR, be tantamount to an economic and social blind alley, to an escalation of the crisis without any hope that the most urgent problems will be solved. It is a choice between the reforms, renewal, and creating a viable economy and stagnation and depriving the country of its future. That is how things stand.

However, the necessity of moving away from the mechanism of economic ties that has taken shape arises not only from the internal processes that are taking place in the countries. The predominant method of forming external economic links on the basis of balanced directives and allocations is an obstacle to mastering new, progressive forms of cooperation and it limits their development. It also deprives the trade and economic ties among the CEMA countries of genuine prospects and makes it impossible to make use of them as a factor to increase economic effectiveness and technical progress.

All this testifies to the fact that our countries have now really come up against a pressing necessity to restructure radically the entire system of economic cooperation, a necessity to go over to economic methods and to make broad use of market relations and to bring our economic ties closer to world conditions.

The existing system of prices and settlements was set up in the conditions when trade turnover was formed at the interstate level and when the CEMA countries were considerably isolated from the world economy. Now, this practice has, in essence, become a brake on the development of ties. The mutual trade prices, formed over the past 5 years on the basis of world prices, are giving rise to considerable distortions in the exchange ratios; they lead to violations of equivalency and mutual advantage and create among the public a false impression of the real mutual relations among our countries.

The system of settlements in transferrable rubles, initially conceived as a multilateral one, has, in fact, disintegrated into bilaterally balanced clearings. The transferrable ruble was and, in essence, remains only an accounting unit, linked neither with the national currencies of the CEMA countries nor with freely convertible currencies, and that is why it cannot serve as a fully fledged means of payment. In the USSR and other countries enterprises received the right to reach out in foreign markets and began to feel the need of real means of payment. In these conditions, the transferrable ruble has turned from an instrument of unification into a barrier to the development of ties. Apart from that, our countries, for the purpose of internal settlements, establish rates of exchange between their national currencies and the transferrable ruble that discriminate against it, relative to the dollar.

It cannot be said that the CEMA countries have not made attempts to promote to a certain degree the introduction of new forms of cooperation and to create international economic associations and joint enterprises. However, they have not produced sufficiently tangible results. The interaction of enterprises and organizations is proceeding with difficulty and is not increasing apace. The further development of economic integration of the CEMA countries has become seriously complicated.

The existing system is by no means an ideal one for those CEMA countries which are situated outside the European region, either. By virtue of historical objective reasons their economic development in the past was made difficult, which made it necessary to set the task to even out the levels of their economic development. Preferences and benefits to these countries, granted by the other CEMA countries, were directed to this purpose. In the new conditions which emerged in connection with the economic reforms in the USSR and other countries, this mechanism is more and more replacing true economic relations with forms of assistance and is becoming an obstacle to contacts between enterprises and to production coordination. That is why for this group of countries the existing system is in need of restructuring taking into account the peculiar characteristics of each of them. Clearly, the mechanism of economic aid must be improved and at the same time new forms of economic relations must be sought which will promote the development of full-blooded and mutually advantageous economic relations.

So, in order not only to preserve everything positive that has been achieved in our mutual relations in past years, but also to give a boost to production and integrational relations, and on this basis mutual trade as well, it is necessary to embark on the restructuring of the whole system of our economic mutual relations.

What steps could we take in this situation?

Of course, the best solution would be to achieve the convertibility of the Soviet ruble and the national currencies of the CEMA countries and to apply them in mutual settlements. But the economic situation which has developed in the countries postpones a practical solution to this task. The utilization in mutual settlements of freely convertible currency, as well as in mutual trade of world market prices, is becoming a real means of transforming the system of economic relations at the present stage. This will make it possible to move cooperation within the CEMA framework onto a new economic basis and to bring its conditions closer to those which are generally accepted in world practice, which would conform with the nature of the reforms being carried out in the countries and would make possible their effective inclusion in the international distribution of labor.

However, the question arises: Will not such a step lead to a breach of mutual ties, and will it not inflict damage on the CEMA countries' economies? It would be unreasonable to ignore these apprehensions. Nevertheless, a sober and objective analysis gives us arguments in favor of such a solution.

It is along this very course that we will be able to build our interaction on a healthy foundation, to transform the mechanism which has developed, by increasing its effectiveness, to achieve growth in the competitiveness of production, and to create conditions for the countries' more active involvement in world economic ties.

In putting forward this proposal, we are fully aware that we must jointly define ways to implement it and to agree on methods to surmount the difficulties which might arise in the process of perestroyka in both multilateral and bilateral relations. Preliminary contacts with the heads of government of a number of countries show that, while sharing the view of the expediency of this step, they also believe that we need a thorough, joint examination of the whole range of matters arising, including on a bilateral basis. We agree with this and proceed from the premise that such a reform must be implemented by stages and will require interim solutions, the use of mixed forms of settlements, and the elaboration on a bilateral basis of a range of accords which take into account the specific features of the individual countries and ease their adaptation to the new system. Particular attention will have to be paid in this regard to the non-European CEMA countries—Vietnam, the Republic of Cuba, and Mongolia. We share those countries' approach to the acceleration of social and economic development on the basis of the structural perestroyka of their economies and the creation of export production facilities which facilitate better use of their labor resources and natural and climatic conditions.

The new system is called upon to increase the degree of interest of enterprises in cooperation, including that on a compensation basis. In a word, a very complex task lies before us, but this does not mean that its practical implementation can be postponed for a lengthy period. This would be economically unjustified, and we are proposing in 1990 to undertake intensive preparatory work so that the first practical steps may be made at the start of the following year, 1991. In connection with this I would like to say that we have agreed with the head of the Polish Government to transfer, as an experiment this year, approximately 10 to 15 percent of our trade turnover to a new system of settlements.

Therefore, the Soviet delegation is proposing that the current session adopt a fundamental decision and determine the main conditions, on the basis of which the corresponding representatives of our countries can get down to bilateral and, where necessary, multilateral, practical talks. This will give all of us an opportunity to approach the problem in a flexible spirit and to work out specific, mutually acceptable accords before the end of the current year.

Undoubtedly, we must concern ourselves with the stability of our trade and economic relations and with giving thorough consideration to each other's interests. In economic relations between the USSR and the CEMA countries a stable stock of mutual exchanges, which fulfills a very important role from the viewpoint of ensuring normal reproduction processes in the countries, has developed. It comprises mutually coordinated supplies of fuel, raw and other materials, and certain types of machinery from the USSR and counter supplies of goods of equal importance and which form the basis of our imports. All the countries are interested in maintaining this stock, but to do so we must also transfer our economic relations to the new conditions, otherwise it [the stock] will lose its dynamism and will not be able to serve as the basis for the development of mutual economic relations either in the near or particularly the long-term future.

The introduction of the new system means radically changing our economic relations; it will make it possible to create conditions inducing the industry of our countries to raise the level and quality of production and to achieve a growth in competitiveness.

Reality is such that now no country in the world can remain outside world economic relations. That kind of isolation or even semi-isolation is excluded both because autarchy restricts the possibilities of development and because of the "global problems" which have emerged and the special features of technical progress at the present stage. Of course, interaction with the world market is a complex process in which economic benefits and advantages go hand in hand with the risk of material damage, and it therefore requires a well-planned strategy and the ability to defend one's interests. However, on the whole since the task of the CEMA countries to organically join in the international division of labor is becoming more and more pressing, the transition to the new conditions of exchange generally accepted in world practice is in keeping with our common strategic interests, creating prerequisites for the gradual adaptation of our countries' economies to the demands of the world economy and joining the all-European integration processes.

Already in the nearest future an important factor in shaping economic relations with West European countries will be the creation of the single internal market of European communities, envisaged for the year 1992. This presents the countries united in CEMA with no easy problems. Ways will have to be found to adapt to the integration processes taking place in Western and Eastern Europe.

A foreign policy based on new thinking and the swing that is underway in international relations toward the establishment of trust and interaction are creating favorable opportunities for this. With the signing of a treaty between the USSR and the European communities, a further step was taken in this direction.

We have spoken so far of transforming the system of our economic relations, primarily in connection with changes in the economic mechanism in most CEMA countries. However, for the development of mutual economic ties, no less importance is attached to structural perestroyka of the national economy, which we must all achieve.

The Second Congress of USSR People's Deputies, which has now taken place, determined the principled approaches to the elaboration of the 13th Soviet 5-Year Plan, which will undoubtedly have an effect on the development of our cooperation with the CEMA countries.

During the work, now in progress, of framing the 5-year plan, a persistent search is taking place for ways to improve the economy, as well as to accomplish the tasks of perestroyka stage by stage. For the first time in our practice when identifying the national economy's development prospects, we have taken as our starting point the question of how people's growing material and spiritual demands can realistically be satisfied. This is the principal objective, and the development of the economy, the fundamental proportions, the structural changes, and investment and scientific-technical policy are geared toward attaining it.

We feel that the problem of intensifying the social reorientation is not just a purely Soviet problem. It is linked to the need to make a definitive departure from the economic model of industrialization which was practiced in the socialist countries in a certain period and to the objective need for radical structural improvements in the material and technical base of production. In other words, it is part of the issue of changing the proportions between the two principal reproductive subdivisions of the economy.

A mutual exchange of views on the subject of how the process of social reorientation will proceed in the countries' economies could ease considerably the coordination of actions in this field and help distribute rationally our efforts to produce equipment for consumer industries and to reach agreement on more sensible specialization, which corresponds to the countries' interests, in the large-scale production of individual types of consumer goods for both current and long-term use. We support the proposals on high-priority areas of cooperation in the social sphere submitted for examination at the session.

The 13th 5-Year Plan will be a complex stage in our country's economic development. The forthcoming years are burdened by severe economic problems: currency and budgetary deficits, the imbalance in the consumer market which has intensified recently, profound disproportions in industry and difficult problems in the development of the agrarian sector. Therefore, in searching for the material resources necessary to lift the economy and to solve socioeconomic tasks and ecological problems, we will have to redistribute our resources and restrict the scale of new industrial construction. We will have to implement a financial recovery program, to eliminate loss-making enterprises and farms, to raise the efficiency of production, to satisfy immediate needs, and, above all, to normalize the situation in the consumer goods market.

It seems to us that the majority of CEMA countries have more or less the same approach. That means that in our cooperation we will all have to focus particular attention on problems of conserving resources, economizing and the rational use of labor, material, and intellectual resources.

From these standpoints we will have to adopt a number of vigorous measures to deepen scientific-technical cooperation and to make effective use toward this end of those opportunities which are laid down in the comprehensive program of scientific-technical progress of the CEMA member countries.

We also will have to make more active use of the potential of the defense industries to technically reequip the national economy and, first and foremost, those industries with a social orientation. Mutual cooperation and exchange of experience also will help us convert the military industry into an additional and very important source of technical progress in all branches of the national economy.

The new problems facing the countries and the community as a whole demand a radical reform of our collective organization—the CEMA.

In the last few years attempts have been made to find an answer to this question. However, it must be said plainly that time has overtaken us, and now we must act more decisively.

The dynamism of life today rejects ossified structures. A mechanism must be devised which will make it possible to flexibly restructure and create new forms of cooperation that are capable of uniting the countries' efforts to implement collective projects, economic and scientific-technical programs. It is from this viewpoint that one should analyze the activity of the previously created international economic organizations of our countries too.

In keeping with the new tasks we will have to reorganize CEMA itself, clarify its functions, its charter, develop the structure of the council and its institutions that will really promote the processes of integration and the development of mutually advantageous trade and scientific-technical exchanges. Evidently, the economic-analytical and forecasting functions of CEMA should be strengthened and should be concentrated to a greater degree on the strategic directions of cooperation.

CEMA must become more economic, not only in its description but also in the content of its work. Its most important function is to improve constantly the mechanism of cooperation. Here, too, it is necessary to make greater use of positive world experience for the quickest possible assimilation of methods of work in world markets and to elaborate mechanisms for interaction by our organization with other international organizations.

At present, as you know, certain progress has been achieved in developing bilateral relations between individual CEMA countries and the EEC. Evidently, we ought to seek new, effective ways of cooperating in various spheres with our organizations as well. It is expedient to arrange contacts with such an authoritative organization as the European Free Trade Association [EFTA] and, also, to display initiative in establishing trilateral ties among all the European communities: CEMA, the EEC, and the EFTA. In our opinion, we could, as a first step, propose to the EEC and EFTA that a meeting of experts be held to discuss possible spheres and areas of joint operations.

Nor can we fail to take into account within our economic policy the fact that processes of integration are occurring, not only in Europe, but also on the American continent and in the Asian and Pacific region. The quest for interaction with them is in accordance with our common interests.

We are all seeking to solve the complex problems which have arisen in the CEMA member countries. Obviously, we all have an interest in our collective efforts becoming a more and more important factor of renewal and progress.

Proceeding from this premise, the Soviet delegation is submitting a proposal for the adoption of a decision in principle on the radical transformation of the system of economic ties and of CEMA itself. Of course, the draft decision of the session prepared initially does not match the character of our discussion and does not even cover the most essential issues. Therefore, we have presented our thoughts on the draft decision, in which we have sought, as far as possible, to reflect the opinions of the other CEMA countries as well.

We propose that the present session should, as a first step, adopt a decision in principle on the transition to new conditions of cooperation and, simultaneously, create a special commission, which will, with the involvement of major specialists, academics, and lawyers, elaborate proposals on the principles, charter, and structure of our collective organization. These proposals can be examined at the next CEMA session. We ought to reach agreement later on when to convene it, taking into account progress in preparing those documents. For the USSR, we propose Academician S.A. Sitaryan, deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers, for that commission.

Thus, our collective organization and the countries united in it themselves are entering a period of intensive perestroyka and renewal. This process is objective; it is caused by historical conditions and the complex problems with which the contemporary world is approaching the frontier of the 3d millennium. We also will have to adopt decisions which match these requirements and can be of truly historic importance for the progress of our countries and the well-being of their peoples.

The delegation heads from the following CEMA countries also spoke at the 45th session: Bulgaria, Hungary, Vietnam, the GDR, Cuba, Mongolia, Poland, Romania, Czechoslovakia, and Yugoslavia.

The session continues its work.

Ryzhkov Meets Romania's Roman

LD0901211590 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1900 GMT 9 Jan 90

[Excerpts] The 45th CEMA session opened in the Bulgarian capital today. [passage omitted]

After the session; Comrades Ryzhkov met Roman, Romanian prime minister and a member of the National Salvation Front. The heads of government expressed a firm confidence that the processes of renewal which are going on in Romania and perestroyka in USSR are opening new possibilities for cooperation between two countries.

Further on Ryzhkov-Roman Talks

LD1001114790 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 0700 GMT 10 Jan 90

[Excerpt] Sofia, 10 Jan (TASS)—[passage omitted] There was a meeting between Nikolay Ryzhkov and Petre Roman, member of the National Salvation Front and Romanian prime minister, on the same day [9 January].

During the conversation there was an exchange of information on the situation in the Soviet Union and Romania. N. Ryzhkov talked about measures being taken in the USSR to further develop the political system and also about the profound transformations in the economy which are being implemented in accordance with the government program.

For his part, P. Roman talked about some of the most important decisions of the National Salvation Front Council, aimed at stabilizing the situation in the country and at performing immediate tasks in the area of economic life. He expressed gratitude for support for the revolutionary transformations being implemented by the Romanianm people and readiness to develop Romanian-Soviet relations on a qualitatively new level.

The heads of governments expressed their firm conviction that restructuring in the USSR and the processes of renewal occurring in Romania are opening up new favorable opportunities for developing cooperation between the two countries, both on a bilateral basis and on a multilateral basis within the framework of the CEMA.

Ryzhkov Meets Cuba's Rodriguez

LD0901204590 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1931 GMT 9 Jan 90

[Text] Sofia, 9 Jan (TASS)—Within the framework of the work of the 45th CEMA session, which is taking place here, there has been a meeting between N.I. Ryzhkov, chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers, and Carlos Rafael Rodriguez, vice president of the Council of State and of the Council of Ministers of the Republic of Cuba.

The main attention during the conversation was focused on the state of, and prospects for Soviet-Cuban economic cooperation on both a bilateral and a multilateral basis within the CEMA framework. Consideration was given to specific aspects of the further development of the two countries' economic interaction in the context of the measures planned within CEMA for radically restructuring and renewing the mechanism of multilateral cooperation.

The Soviet Union and Cuba, N.I. Ryzhkov and C.R. Rodriguez stressed, have accumulated great experience in all-round cooperation, based on a sincere interest in the successful development of the two countries. They will build their economic ties in accordance with the demands of the present period, proceeding from the concrete realities and traditional friendly bonds linking our countries and peoples.

Several current issues relating to trade and economic cooperation also were examined.

Hungary's Nemeth Meets Ryzhkov

LD1001063790 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 0558 GMT 10 Jan 90

[Text] Sofia, 10 Jan (TASS)—Nikolay Ryzhkov, chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers, met Miklos

Nemeth, chairman of the Council of Ministers of the Hungarian Republic, here on 9 January.

In the course of the conversation there was an exchange of opinions on a number of pressing issues of bilateral cooperation, taking into account the new conditions that are taking shape in the course of the implementation of the deep political and economic transformations that are being brought about in the CEMA countries.

Ideas were also expressed regarding the significance of the 45th sitting of the CEMA session for the radical perestroyka of the cooperation of the member countries of this organization for the possibilities of creating the prerequisites for the active introduction in practice of economic relations of new progressive forms of economic cooperation.

Both sides stressed the need to continue the search for ways of achieving a radical improvement in and a renewal of the mechanism of multilateral cooperation.

'New Pattern' of CEMA Cooperation Seen

LD0901152490 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1030 GMT 9 Jan 90

[Text] The 45th CEMA session opened in the Bulgarian capital today. Our correspondent Viktor Samarin reports from Sofia:

[Samarin] The current CEMA session has started its 2-day proceedings at the People's Palace of Culture. All 10 countries, the community members, are taking part; they are represented by the heads of their governments. Outside observers from Yugoslavia, Angola, Afghanistan, the People's Democratic Republic of Yemen, Mozambique, Laos, Ethiopia, and Nicaragua have been invited. I think it will not be a revelation to anyone to say that quite a few complex problems have accumulated in the CEMA, complex to such a degree that some community member countries have even started voicing doubts about the expediency of its further existence. Bulgarian economists seem to disagree with that but they point out, too, that the perestroyka processes taking place in socialist countries' internal life have come into conflict with the deep- rooted shortcomings and omissions in the CEMA's activity. That is why, perhaps, the comprehensive program for the technical development of CEMA member countries up to the year 2000 has started skidding from the very beginning of its implementation, now because of financial and currency discrepancies, now because of technological disorder and differences in quality criteria, now because of organizational mess and bureaucratic barriers.

Here is curious information, food for thought, as the saying goes. Journalists from the United States, Britain, Sweden, Japan, and even Australia have come to this session, according to their own words, not in the anticipation of a hypothetical collapse of the CEMA but rather with a prescience of its sensational rebirth as an economic alliance, close cooperation with which will benefit both the EEC and the West on the whole.

The experts included in all the delegations are convinced that it is precisely now that it will be possible to constructively transform the entire mechanism of economic interaction within the CEMA and to cardinally reinforce the community's social orientation, i.e. the links between countries which will bring quick and substantial profits to their population and will expand the consumer market. They raise a question, in fact, of a new pattern of cooperation within the CEMA system, which makes it possible to efficiently combine planning and contractual relations, to solve the problems of price formation and multilateral payments, and to bolser joint production activity and trade.

Commentator Outlines Problems

LD0801202390 Moscow International Service in Slovak 1600 GMT 8 Jan 90

[Commentary by Yakov Malykin]

[Text] The 45th CEMA session begins in Sofia on 9 January. Here is a commentary by Yakov Malykin.

Recently there has been no shortage of forecasts, not only on the session itself, but also about the future of CEMA. The range of views in the East and West is relatively wide, beginning with unavoidable cardinal changes, right down to the liquidation of the council. It is not difficult to find an explanation for this. The present meeting of government premiers is taking place in Sofia at an extremely unusual time. The revolutionary events in East European countries present each country with a question concerning its main directions, both in domestic and foreign economic policy.

If we summarize the views of three economists considering this question, the conclusion will be unequivocal: CEMA is necessary, but CEMA should be different. Reforms in its circles of activity are necessary; it must correspond to the spirit of the times, the real needs of every country. We all wish to live under conditions of public information and democracy, and we naturally want an improvement in the standard of living.

While public information is already a fact for the European countries of CEMA, things are not so good as far as the standard of living is concerned. Old methods of management undermined the economy in many of them. In many countries, economic reforms are taking place, but by no means do they always bring quick results. What is more, a high standard of living does not grow on trees. Above all it depends on the extent to which a particular country makes use of the gains of the scientific-technical revolution.

The need to keep up with the times dictated to CEMA the decision to work for and realize the comprehensive program of scientific-technical progress. A similar program, Eureka, with similar priority directions is taking place in Western Europe. We find that the points of reference selected are the same. However, one country cannot succeed alone in scientific-technical progress, which is why the West has started out on the road of integration, and by 1992 it proposes to create a unified European market.

What about the countries of CEMA? Already, at the beginning of the seventies, they adopted a comprehensive program of socialist economic integration. Its effective realization was, however, prevented by the concrete obstacles of the imperfection of the mechanism of economic cooperation. They are still in the way, and there are many examples of this. For example, the comprehensive program of scientific-technical progress. Today, its realization has, it seems, moved out of a dead end, but there are still many problems. Interesting modern projects developed at the expense of extraordinary efforts often cannot be implemented in mass production. Science also is falling behind.

The question of the course and realization of the comprehensive program is on the agenda of the present CEMA session. Let us hope that it will be successful in setting out ways to solve the problem.

Let us look at the other side of cooperation. The countries of CEMA have reached the conclusion that it is vital to develop direct relations between enterprises, to start joint organization. But this is hindered by the question of mutual accounting, differences in the creation of prices in various countries. So is this a dead end? Not at all. Every CEMA country trades on world markets where world prices apply. Why should the partners in CEMA not use these in mutual accounts. At the forthcoming CEMA session we will propose, beginning in 1991, a transition in mutual trade to current world prices in freely convertible currency, Soviet Premier Nikolay Ryzhkov said recently.

We have spoken only about some problems, of which there are many more in reality. One of the most important tools to solve them is the transition to market relations. The foundations have already been laid. At the Soviet Union's suggestion at the 1988 CEMA session it was decided to begin with the creation of a joint market of socialist countries. Naturally this is complicated. Such a market, they tell us, must be created gradually. We agree, but it is time to take the first steps. So far they have not been made.

Today is a crucial time for CEMA. For all of us it is vital to perfect our relations, to make them more flexible and effective. Naturally, no one expects that it will be possible to solve all questions at the CEMA session which is just beginning in Sofia. However, it is important to set the points of reference.

Perestroyka Seen as Answer to CEMA Problems

PM0901112190 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 5 Jan 90 Second Edition p 5

[Article by A. Nekipelov, deputy director of the USSR Academy of Sciences Economics of the World Socialist System Institute, under the rubric "Toward the CEMA Session's 45th Sitting": "Path of Renewal"]

[Text] **For a time the latest events in the socialist countries' political life have distracted attention from the problems of economic cooperation within the CEMA framework. At the same time it is precisely thanks to the political transformations that crisis phenomena, both in the economic mechanism of individual countries and also in cooperation between them, are being discussed openly today at the very highest level. But whereas each state has the right to solve independently its internal economic problems, reforming the structure of international economic relations can only be done jointly. It is precisely this task which faces the CEMA member countries. Vital questions of cooperation and its prospects also will be discussed at the CEMA's 45th sitting, which will open 9 January in Sofia.**

In modern capitalist economies, integration has become the instrument for solving many economic problems and one of the factors for the significant acceleration of scientific and technical progress. It is interesting that the integration, for example, of West European states began about 30 years ago, and the CEMA countries adopted the Comprehensive Program for Socialist Economic Integration, calculated for 15 to 20 years, in 1971. The time has come to sum up the results, but a great deal of the plan outlined has remained on paper. The key task has not been solved—by means of close cooperation assisting the rationalization of individual countries' national economic structures, and switching the national economies to a system of intensive reproduction. It should be recognized that until now exports and imports of goods and services are formed not so much on the basis of maximum efficiency in the use of existing resources, as in accordance with the need to patch holes appearing in the physical balances both in drawing up and in fulfilling the plan.

This approach to foreign economic ties worked more or less well enough at the stage of extensive economic development. When the resources for this development were exhausted, the tendency to cut mutual exchange was inevitable. Indeed, as calculations show, in the last three 5-year plans within the CEMA framework there has been a steady drop in the dynamics of the physical (that is, calculated in constant prices) trade turnover volume.

The philosopher is right: It is difficult to catch a black cat in a dark room, especially if it is not there. He just forgot to add that in these conditions you can spend a very long time trying to catch it, without losing hope of success. And so, within the framework of the economic cooperation mechanism that has taken shape, we have used virtually every conceivable and inconceivable means to break the growth of negative processes in integrational cooperation. Only with the beginning of perestroyka did it become clear that the administrative-edict model of socialism itself is ineffective. Hence, only one step remained to recognizing the ineffectiveness of its natural product—the mechanism of economic cooperation within the CEMA framework. This step was taken at the November (1986) meeting of the fraternal countries' leaders in Moscow, which deemed it necessary to embark on a course of renewing the forms and methods of economic ties.

At the CEMA's 43d session (1987) nine countries (all the members of the organization except Romania) decided to channel the integration process toward the formation of a united socialist market. The 44th sitting (1988) ordered the CEMA Executive Committee's interim working group to conduct a detailed study of the questions connected with this. It would seem that the main thing had been done and the rest was a technicality. Alas, life has shown that this is far from so.

The specific character of the modern situation is that there is a group of countries in the community with very radical projects for the market reformation of the economy, but there are no countries whose economies are now regulated by market mechanisms. What is more, in a number of states with "serious intentions" (including the USSR), in fact there is a move not so much toward the market as away from it. Internal imbalance virtually everywhere has led to the adoption of harsh measures to protect the retail trade from tourists from other CEMA countries.

The question arises: Is it generally justifiable in these conditions to set the task of creating a united market? In my view, if we proceed from the premise that the process of socialist integration has a future, then the answer must be positive. The policy of a united market in this case symbolizes the desire of the appropriate countries to switch to the market model of integration (but what other integration can there be between market economies?). The practical consequences of this "symbolic" approach amount to the following.

First, it is necessary to give up finally and irrevocably our deeply rooted conviction concerning the economy—that "even if it is impossible, if you really want to, then it is possible." It is said that we realize that CEMA cannot be restructured without progress in internal reforms, but there is no need to wait.

Second, the way toward a united market is through the process of opening up national markets to each other, through their interaction and equalization on this basis of the economic conditions of commodity-money circulation (primarily prices). But you can only open up something that exists, and the formation of national markets is taking place not only slowly but also unequally in the countries. So, we should regard as perfectly normal not only the accelerated development of market relations between the countries most prepared for this but also the adoption of unilateral measures providing access to the national market for integration partners.

Third, in the present situation, containing a significant element of uncertainty, it is simply harmful to get involved in hasty organizational perestroykas within the CEMA framework and in the preparation of various international-legal documents meant to regulate the process of creating a united market. I cannot agree with the recent proposals on assigning CEMA organs certain supranational functions: Right now this would inevitably lead to the spread of administrative-edict methods to the international sphere, since the forms of indirect management of the economic processes have not yet undergone the necessary development in the countries.

Until recently integration in the community was regarded as something self-evident, as a natural stage in the internationalization of production among states with the same socioeconomic system, as a reliable basis for their unity. Now the situation has changed. We are better aware of the integrity of the modern world and the interdependence of all the peoples inhabiting it. The bipolar thinking (socialism—capitalism) is becoming a thing of the past. The entire system of views regarding the participation of socialist countries in international political, economic and humanitarian ties is undergoing revision.

The deideologization of interstate relations, of course, does not exclude the possibility that socialist integration will develop further, but it noticeably influences the motivation of countries wishing to proceed along this path. Strictly economic considerations are beginning to come to the fore; we are having to compare the effectiveness of the most diverse ways of involving the country in global economic processes. Taking this into account, nothing reprehensible can be found in the fact that individual CEMA countries are now making appreciable amendments to the priorities of their foreign economic policy.

Recently the sphere of the socialist countries' mutual relations, and also the problems of the USSR's economic cooperation with its CEMA partners have been increasingly widely discussed in the press. This can only be welcomed. It is another matter that we ought not to "rush in" here: This concerns an extremely delicate matter, and any bias in the way it is treated can have very unfavorable consequences. For example, from time to time one encounters the viewpoint that trade with CEMA partners is unprofitable for the Soviet Union and it is therefore necessary for us to change immediately the situation which has taken shape in this sphere, switching to settlements in convertible currency and to using current world prices.

First of all—the economic advantages. Calculations clearly testify that exchange with the CEMA countries gives a substantial saving on national economic resources. That is, if we were suddenly to decide to produce for ourselves everything that we import from these countries, and we were to stop delivering our own output which goes to pay for the imports, then we would lose—and, moreover, lose considerably. Admittedly, this question can be approached from a different angle: Let us take and compare the efficiency of our exchange with the socialist and capitalist countries. It will turn out that on the whole there is more to be gained in trade with Western states. This occurs because for a number of reasons the level of prices for processing industry output on the CEMA market is higher than on the world market, while for fuel and raw materials they generally correspond to world prices. But as you know, we chiefly export fuel and raw materials and import finished industrial goods.

But it should not be forgotten that the existing structure of reciprocal deliveries and the economic conditions of exchange in the CEMA market did not emerge overnight. They are the result of the strategy of the international socialist division of labor, which has been implemented over a long time and whose initiator and main inspiration was the USSR. As a consequence of this policy a considerable part of the fraternal countries' economic potentials was geared to the Soviet "market." The question arises: Do we have the right now, citing our own "missed" advantage, to demand of our partners an immediate switch to fundamentally different terms of cooperation?

Of course, it is not a question of "preserving" backwardness. Perestroyka of the division of labor which has taken shape within the CEMA framework is inevitable. It is a question of fairly spreading the costs connected with this among the countries.

As for the switch to settlements in convertible currency, it should be borne in mind that in the event of a simultaneous abandonment of interstate commitments on output deliveries, the said measure, for all its other possible merits, can in no way help to develop the integration process. Rather the reverse: In this case firms from CEMA member countries must compete equally with firms from any other world state, while integration always presupposes certain reciprocal benefits for partner countries.

In completing these polemical notes I would like to stress once again that the problems existing in CEMA are by no means autonomous in character: They represent only one of the manifestations of the crisis of the entire administrative-edict economy. It is precisely for this reason that their solution depends directly on the success of the perestroyka process in the East European countries and in the USSR.

CEMA Seen in Need of 'Radical Changes'

PM0901171990 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 10 Jan 90 Morning Edition p 1

[V. Rodionov article: "Radical Changes Necessary: On the Opening of the CEMA Session in Sofia"]

[Text] Frankly speaking, I am tired of writing yet again, before the opening of a CEMA session, that it should "give new impetus" and "raise cooperation to a genuinely new level." At the same time both these things are highly necessary—not merely in words, but in practice.

The 45th sitting of the CEMA session has been postponed repeatedly. Perhaps this is for the better. It was a largely different group of people who sat down at the conference table in Sofia on 9 January—heads of government who have received a mandate from demanding and exacting organs of people's representation, who are directly responsible to them, and who are called upon to defend not abstract ideas, but the concrete interests of their states. The correlation of political forces is now completely different in Poland, the GDR, and Czechoslovakia, to say nothing of Romania. At the same time there are among the CEMA "Ten" some states that have been less affected, or almost unaffected, by the winds of change.

It will be more difficult than ever before to find a common denominator. This was indicated by the "trial balloon" sent up by Czechoslovakia's new finance minister, V. Klaus. He caused a sensation in the world press by telling the Polish newspaper RZECZPOSPOLITA that unless the body approved a proposal to annul the entire range of agreements concluded earlier within CEMA, Czechoslovakia would unilaterally leave the organization. (CSSR Premier M. Calfa later repudiated this statement.) Literally on the eve of the Sofia meeting, P. Medgyessy, deputy chairman of the Hungarian Council of Ministers, said unequivocally in NEPSZABADSAG: "At present, and even more in future, CEMA is not capable of serving either the development of the member countries or their integration in central and Eastern Europe."

Centrifugal trends within CEMA's ranks are natural and understandable. The mechanism of cooperation within this organization was generated by the bureaucratic, administrative edict system on the Stalinist model, and is patently obsolete. Socialist economic integration, which was intended to give CEMA a second wind, has not justified these hopes. The most important joint programs, in particular those relating to scientific and technical progress, have for the most part remained on paper. The CEMA countries' laggardness in relation to world levels continues to grow. The mechanism for boosting the less developed CEMA countries—Cuba, Vietnam, and Mongolia—also proved ineffective. The system of settling mutual accounts is disorganized, and the impression is created that all the CEMA countries trade with one another to their own loss. It is therefore not surprising that what is happening is not progressive development, but gradual curtailment of mutual trade.

The Soviet Union is convinced that CEMA is restructurable, on condition that the cooperation mechanism is radically reformed. It is proposed, as of 1991, to switch in mutual trade to current world prices, with payment in hard currency. This is no easy matter. When the Hungarian economists, who had long been pressing for such a solution, did all their calculations, it turned out that instead of the current substantial trade surplus with the USSR, Hungary would have a deficit of $1 billion to $1.5 billion. Nevertheless, the problem must be solved. In conditions of drastic economic reform and genuine economic accountability all commodities, including fuel, raw materials, and power, must be sold at real world market prices. There would be no more mutual concessions on matters of quality and regularity of supplies.

At great expense the CEMA countries have established their own ramified system of power transmission lines and oil and gas pipelines, geared primarily to Soviet supplies. It is still operating, despite all the problems. It would be a fanciful illusion to forget about this. Also, it was no accident that when V. Klaus had spoken, the Paris paper LE MONDE reminded him of Czechoslovakia's raw material and energy dependence. One imagines that both Czechoslovak and Hungarian consumers would like to continue to have warmth and light in their homes. Moreover, Soviet consumers would hope that the medicines they have grown accustomed to will not disappear from the pharmacies and other popular East European goods from the stores. However difficult it might be, the interests of the USSR and its CEMA partners can and must be harmonized. "The Soviet Union is objectively the natural center, the nucleus of the integration processes in our community," CEMA Executive Committee Chairman Andrey Lukanov, a Bulgarian, rightly pointed out recently.

Radical reform of CEMA, the resolute elimination of the organization's bureaucratic "traditions," and the formation of a combined market of interested CEMA countries would also help overcome crisis phenomena in the participating countries' economies and contribute to their more effective, equal involvement in all-European and world integration processes.

'Radical Perestroyka' Required

PM0901165790 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 9 Jan 90 Second Edition p 1

[Article by Boris Averchenko, editor of PRAVDA's Socialist Countries Department, under the "Editor's Opinion" rubric: "Mutual Interest"]

[Text] The 45th CEMA Session opens in Sofia today. It is being held at an unusual time marked by major changes in the life of the fraternal countries' peoples. Processes of democratization, the development of glasnost, and the renewal of socialism are occurring here. The economy is being restructured and a "new model" of the economy corresponding to the contemporary stage of the world scientific-technical and technological revolution is being shaped through search and experiments.

Of course, each country is conducting this renewal in its own way in the light of actual conditions, national specifics, and its level of development. The automatic use of other people's experience is resolutely rejected, although some elements are being adapted and applied.

CEMA is into its 5th decade now. From the very outset it was an important factor in the fraternal countries' socioeconomic development. Equitable mutual cooperation helped consolidate their material and technical base and national sovereignty and create modern new economic sectors.

As is well known, CEMA now has 10 states which account for approximately one-third of world industrial production and one-fourth of world national income. It is worth noting that in the past 40 years the CEMA countries' reciprocal trade turnover has increased by a factor of 40.

By pooling their efforts and resources, the CEMA countries have created huge industrial facilities. They have produced oil and gas pipelines and energy and transport systems stretching thousands of kilometers. There is the common fleet of freightcars and "Intermetall," "Agromash," "Interatominstrument," and dozens of other joint international organizations are in operation.

All these things are undoubtedly the common assets of the CEMA states. Nevertheless, the demands of the times are higher. A new and, I would say, crucial period has begun in the friendly countries' mutual cooperation. What will happen next? Do they progress together and, resolutely deepening integration, become part of the world economic system, or do they act separately and essentially become a different system?

I do not hide the fact that on the eve of the 45th CEMA session the most conflicting rumors have spread on this score: One country intends to leave CEMA; another is expressing dissatisfaction and intends to regard its opinion as the only correct one. I shall leave those rumors and, in some cases, conjectures to the conscience of my foreign colleagues. I am going to talk about something else: The national economy of the CEMA countries is now permeated by hundreds, even thousands of interlinked arteries which in many ways set their economic pulse.

Those countries' bilateral and multilateral ties created in the postwar years were an objective requirement of their development, and it is not easy for particular governments to change that. As for the Soviet Union, our position remains unchanged: We favored and still favor the broadest development of mutually beneficial cooperation. Our course is the all-around deepening of the CEMA countries' economic integration and the formation of their united market.

The land of the Soviets has long-standing, firm economic ties with its European neighbors and with allies on other continents. They are based on strict observance of the principles of equitability, equivalent exchange of the products of national labor, mutual benefit, and mutual assistance, and, at the same time, a lofty sense of internationalism. Thus, aware that the European CEMA members have extremely limited raw material resources, the Soviet Union continues to a decisive extent to meet their needs for oil, petroleum products, and natural gas and to supply them with a large amount of hard coal, ore, and electricity.

The CEMA countries in turn send us nonferrous metals, chemical products, and machine-building and consumer goods. Putting it another way, the CEMA countries account for around 60 percent of the Soviet Union's foreign trade turnover.

At the same time, almost all the CEMA members now acknowledge that the present economic cooperation mechanism does not meet the demands of the time or the interests of implementing progressive reforms. Furthermore, it has even become a brake on that path. What are the reasons for this? There is no single answer. The prime reason, plainly, is that many of the forms of interaction established in the past have clearly become obsolete. The economic cooperation mechanism needs radical perestroyka.

Life itself suggests the direction to take: It is necessary to more quickly give a qualitatively new impetus to mutual cooperation and to harmonize it with the dynamic processes taking place in the allied countries. The movement toward the convertibility of national currencies is acquiring special significance. There is a proposal that from the beginning of next year reciprocal trade among the CEMA countries should be switched to current world prices with payment in hard currency. And that, it is not hard to see, will open the way to active involvement in international economic ties.

The CEMA countries possess a substantial production and scientific-technical potential and have enough natural resources and skilled cadres. In brief, they have everything that they need to take a mighty leap forward together if they deepen their integration ties. All the CEMA members have an interest in that, I think. And mutual interest is the main thing uniting us now on the difficult path of transformations.

Warsaw Pact Information Group Meets 9-10 Jan

LD1001130990 Moscow TASS in English 1258 GMT 10 Jan 90

[Text] Moscow January 10 TASS—The Warsaw Pact multilateral group for current information exchanges met in Moscow on January 9 and 10.

The group discussed topical international issues, including developments in Europe and the world at the end of the 1980s and the roles of the Warsaw Pact and NATO in the present conditions.

Gerasimov Gives Foreign Ministry Briefing 10 Jan

Va'ezi Visit, Iraq Talks

LD1001143290 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1340 GMT 10 Jan 90

[Text] Moscow, 10 Jan (TASS)—Gennadiy Gerasimov, head of the Information Directorate of the USSR Foreign Ministry, stated at a briefing today that the working visit to the USSR by Mahmud Va'ezi, deputy foreign minister of Iran, is a continuation of the active political dialogue between the Soviet Union and Iran.

He reported that Mahmud Vaezi was received by Eduard Shevardnadze, USSR Foreign Minister and Aleksandr Bessmertnykh, first deputy minister. The Iranian side passed on a verbal message from 'Ali Velayati, the Iranian foreign minister, which expressed satisfaction with the development of Soviet-Iranian relations.

Gennadiy Gerasimov noted that a considerable part of the message was devoted to matters of the Iran-Iraq conflict, in particular the Soviet proposal on a meeting between the foreign ministers of the three countries—USSR, Iran, and Iraq—on Soviet territory. The Foreign Ministry spokesman said that this is not a substitute for the UN secretary general's mission in the Iran-Iraq settlement. The idea of a trilateral meeting of ministers had been touched on beforehand, both in conversations with the UN secretary general and with representatives of Iran and Iraq, he said.

Gennadiy Gerasimov reported that 'Ali Velayati's message expressed the Iranian side's wish to hold such a meeting. "Since the Iraqi side has already consented to holding such a meeting, it is now possible to begin practical study of this matter, but it is still too early to speak of times and details of a meeting," he noted.

During the meetings in Moscow, matters relating to the development of border contacts between the USSR and Iran were broached. They were discussed at a practical level with a consular delegation of the Iranian Foreign Ministery which has also been in the Soviet capital in the last few days. These consultations will continue, Gennadiy Gerasimov noted.

Weizman Visit, Abe-Gorbachev Talks

PM1001122990 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 10 Jan 90 Morning Edition p4

[Own correspondent G. Charodeyev report from the USSR Foreign Ministry Press Center: "Rumors Giving Rise to Panic"]

[Excerpts] A scheduled briefing for Soviet and foreign journalists was addressed by G.I. Gerasimov, chief of the USSR Foreign Ministry Information Administration.

"In line with an earlier accord," the person chairing the briefing said, "Mr S. Abe, member of the Japanese Liberal Democratic Party and former Japanese foreign minister, will soon be arriving in Moscow at the invitation of the CPSU Central Committee. The program for his visit includes a conversation with M.S. Gorbachev. I take particular satisfaction in telling you this because it is our indirect response to the allegations—of which there were more than enough at the end of last week—that the Soviet leader has canceled meetings with foreign visitors for the whole of January. These rumors have mainly given rise to panic on Tokyo's stock exchange. So, in order to restore equilibrium there, we now inform you that Mr Abe will be received in Moscow at the highest level."

As already reported in IZVESTIYA (No 9), Israeli Minister of Science and Technology 'Ezer Weizman is in the Soviet Union on a visit at the invitation of the USSR Academy of Sciences. In this connection, a journalist from Lebanon asked whether the Israeli representative had met with any Soviet officials in Moscow.

"We do not have such information," G.I. Gerasimov replied.

Perez De Cuellar To Visit Moscow, Address Forum

LD0901190390 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1831 GMT 9 Jan 90

[Text] New York, 3 Jan (TASS)—UN Secretary General Xavier Perez de Cuellar will visit Moscow at the end of the week. This was stated at a briefing today by the UN secretary general's official spokesman. He will make a speech at a global forum on the environment and economic development.

Prospects for Easing Cocom Restrictions Viewed

PM1001104390 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 9 Jan 90 Morning Edition p 1

[Own correspondent Yu. Kovalenko report: "Cocom: Review of Positions or Cosmetic Measures?"]

[Text] Paris—Judging by reports in the Paris press, one of the main instruments of the "cold war" for decades, the Coordinating Committee for Multilateral Export Controls [Cocom], intends to review the lists of banned goods and remove certain restrictions.

"The United States and the West European countries agreed that the changes occurring in East Europe demand a new approach on the part of Cocom," Dennis Kloske, U.S. deputy secretary of state, stated in an interview with LE FIGARO. With this aim, representatives of the Cocom member countries—the NATO member states (except Iceland), Japan, and Australia—will gather for a meeting to be held in early 1990 in Paris, where the committee has its headquarters in a U.S. Embassy building.

Until recently, Washington has been able to dictate terms to the Cocom member countries. But the West Europeans, primarily Paris and Bonn, are increasingly insistently demanding the abolition of restrictions which are impeding the development of trade with the socialist countries. Cocom has been sharply criticized by some French ministers, representatives of business circles, and the presidents of the biggest companies, who believe that the United States is using it primarily for protectionist purposes and via this organ is preventing the conclusion of profitable contracts. At its December session the parliamentary assembly of the Western European Union advocated a full review of the Cocom lists in order to help trade and economic exchanges between East and West.

Today these exchanges, according to French estimates, total about $30 billion per year and could significantly increase but for the harsh Cocom limits. The list of goods banned for delivery to the socialist countries is almost 100 pages long.

The West Europeans are unhappy that Cocom serves Washington's interests to a significant degree.

After protracted battles around Cocom, the United States will be forced to make certain concessions to its West European partners. At present, D. Kloske said, a number of U.S. Government establishments are busy preparing a multistage plan which will also be examined at the forthcoming talks in Paris.

Washington's plan is based on a "selective approach" to the East European countries. The "indulgences" they have in mind, to all appearances, primarily apply to Hungary and Poland, which must give "guarantees" that the latest technology given to them will not subsequently end up in the "hands of the Soviets."

So, under pressure from its allies, Washington, by all accounts, agreed to a revision of the Cocom lists. But, fearing the "disorderly liberalization" of trade with the East, the United States is insisting that a coordinated policy be worked out to maintain full control over the export of advanced technology and the possibility of blocking the sale of certain goods.

In present conditions, observers believe, a review of Cocom's activity is inevitable. Moreover, the West Europeans will scarcely agree to cosmetic measures alone.

Internal Affairs Official on Joining Interpol

LD0801220190

[Editorial Report] Moscow Domestic Service in Russian at 1540 GMT on 8 January carries a 20-minute "Man and Law" program, in which announcer (Yulia Chertkova) first talks about plans for the USSR Internal Affiars Ministry to join Interpol, the International Criminal Police Organization, and then interviews Ivan Fedorovich Shilov, USSR deputy minister of internal affairs. Shilov recalls meeting the Interpol Secretary General in September 1989, and goes on to say that the result of this meeting was a mutual agreement and interest in cooperation. He continues:

"We have no obstacles to joining Interpol, and I think this will happen during the next session, the 59th, of the Interpol General Assembly, which will take place in Canada this fall."

Asked if there is a need to join Interpol, Shilov says: "First of all, I would like to stress that at present we have considerably eased the procedures for entry into and exit from the Soviet Union. Considering the professional point of view, we are interested in all the directions and forms of cooperation along Interpol lines. At present we are interested in foreign experience, including experience in practical interaction between police forces of different countries in solving the concrete questions and problems of fighting international crime, including organized crime. Therefore, we have direct interest in this context, despite the fact that we will have to pay considerable Interpol membership fees in convertible currency, of course. It would be simpler if it was in our rubles.

"I would like to single out as a priority area the fight against illegal drug trafficking. This is of great interest to us. Also, money counterfeiting operations, this is also a very imporatant matter. And in these areas we have mutual points of interaction and cooperation. And a question of no small importance is the search for stolen treasures of cultural value. In principle, I agree with Mr (Kendal's) opinion, as expressed during our talk, that InterpoL needs the USSR now, but the USSR will have a more pressing need of Interpol some time later."

Chertkova then explains the nature of Interpol work, and says that the Soviet militia have been cooperating with police forces of other countries even prior to joining Interpol. She quotes from the interview given by French Interior Minister Joxe, who recently visited the USSR, in which he describes the life of French policemen.

Following a brief interlude, (Chertkova) returns to the topic of Soviet cooperation with Interpol, and provides further details on the work of the organization. She then asks Shilov about the USSR's contribution to the fight against drug addiction. Shilov replies:

"A situation that is not simple, but complex, has to be noted. To date we have 130,000 people registered as making nonmedicinal use of drugs. Of these, nearly 60,000 have been declared to be suffering from drug addiction. The task of the internal affairs organs lies in fighting the criminal production and distribution of narcotics. This problem in our country is alarming, since 115,000 crimes connected with drugs have been committed over the last 2 or 3 years, of which 11,000 were crimes committed by pushers and dealers in the drug business.

"The USSR, for the moment, accounts for less than 1% in the illegal distribution of narcotics, the contraband of which you spoke. One of the reasons for this situation can be considered the existence in our country of a raw material base—I mean Manchurian hemp and poppies. And it also has to be said that, for the moment, the smugglers are not showing a great deal of interest; and the reason for this, for the moment, lies in the inconvertibility of the Soviet ruble. But that's for the moment.

Shelov concludes: "I would like to cite a few examples. For example, our country's customs organs on several occasions have discovered serious cases of the illegal transit of narcotics across the territory of the USSR, as a result of which more than 10 tonnes of hashish were confiscated. And jointly with our Canadian colleagues we exposed an international criminal group, from which more than 5 tonnes of hashish were confiscated. Also, a joint operation was conducted with the British authorities, as a result of which 3.5 tons of hashish were confiscated. By the way, as an international fighter against drug addiction, the Soviet Union has not as yet, one can say, made its mark. We are novices in this work. Our contribution is, as yet, extremely modest, but we now have begun to become involved in this process, and we hope to play an active role in this important field of international cooperation."

New Year Prospects for East-West Ties Reviewed

PM0901094990 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 7 Jan 90 First Edition p 3

[Article by commentator Vasiliy Pustov under the rubric "The World Today: Problems and Opinions": "Hoping for Better"]

[Text] The first week of the new year is over. The results of the past year have been summed up and people's thoughts are switching from a "retrospective of 1989" to the "prospects for 1990." What kind of year will it be? What can and should people hope for, what should they strive for, and what should they fear?

It should be clear to everyone that great work lies ahead to make use of the substantial groundwork already done in terms of new achievements on the path toward a better future for mankind and a secure world. But hardly anyone is satisfied with such generalized reasoning now. The discussion must be specific and businesslike. There must be greater precision.

I want to begin, therefore, with the tumultuous revolutionary events in the East European countries. Some in the West still tend to pin hopes for the disintegration of the Warsaw Pact on the drama there. However, their prophecies are not coming true; the alliance has passed the test. Prague, Bucharest, Berlin, and the other East European capitals are declaring their loyalty to the alliance commitments, stressing that the Warsaw Pact remains the crucial guarantee of their sovereignty and security and of respect for and the inviolability of state borders. In this way the alliance will continue to make a vitally important contribution to the maintenance of stability in Europe, in which, by the way, all countries are interested—not just on the continent but also beyond it.

In the new year and the longer term the two military alliances—the Warsaw Pact and NATO—will remain a reality. Despite that fact, there are grounds for hoping for their gradual transformation in a positive direction. By acting as political alliances whose mutual relations would be switched to a nonconfrontational course, the Warsaw Pact and NATO could, on the basis of high joint responsibility, ensure the stability of the situation and help to consolidate international security. The same aim undoubtedly will be served by the planned signing this year of such documents as the Soviet-U.S. treaty on the 50-percent reduction of strategic offensive armaments, the Soviet-U.S. agreement on the radical reduction of arsenals of chemical weapons, the protocols to the 1974 and 1976 treaties limiting underground nuclear weapon tests and nuclear explosions for peaceful purposes, and other accords.

There is a real hope that the further development of the all-European process, in which the balance of forces will be replaced by a balance of states' interests, will be marked as early as this year by a number of events of great significance. One can hardly overestimate the importance of the Soviet idea of holding in 1990 a meeting of the heads of state and government of the 35 countries within the framework of the Helsinki process, a meeting which has already been dubbed Helsinki-2. In addition to a multilateral agreement on the reduction of conventional armed forces and arms in Europe, that meeting could also see the signing of agreements on confidence-building measures which are being prepared at the 35-state talks in Vienna. There could also be a discussion of ways to continue overcoming military confrontation in Europe. This presupposes the implementation of such projects as, for example, the creation of a center to reduce the risk of war and prevent a surprise attack.

The seminar planned for Vienna 16 January through 5 February to discuss and compare military doctrines is designed to end the mutual suspicion and distrust which have been cultivated for decades. It has been decided to discuss all aspects of those doctrines: the military-political as well as the military-technical with regard to both nuclear weapons and conventional armed forces. This idea, repeatedly mooted by the socialist countries and accepted by all the other participants in the 35-state Vienna talks, has a particular point and significance. This is because the upcoming forum should mark the beginning of the movement toward ensuring that military doctrines, primarily those of the Warsaw Pact and NATO, are based solely on the principle of defensive sufficiency. Incidentally, the socialist countries, and not only they, are still seriously concerned about the concept of "nuclear deterrence" persisting within NATO and the first nuclear strike directive contained in it. The seminar participants will not be able to avoid that problem.

The encouraging prospects for rapprochement on a number of problems between the Warsaw Pact and NATO countries should not obscure the fact that there are still highly influential circles in the West which, even in the new conditions, are seeking to obtain unilateral advantages. They are trying to take advantage of everything they can and cannot, such as the rapid changes in the East European countries, depicting them as the result of the NATO bloc's position-of-strength policy and pressing for their continuation. In the United States, for example, these circles, which have an interest in the implementation of more and more new military programs, are activating powerful financial and other levers to influence Congress and the government so as to maintain the confrontational mood in policy and to revive the moribund "enemy image" built up over the decades. That is why when discussing the possibility of the start of an "age of radically reduced tension between the superpowers" and the need to reduce America's armed forces, THE WASHINGTON POST warns: "When resolving all these problems, politicians will clash with local interests which will fight tooth and nail to keep military contracts and the associated jobs as well as with stubborn corporations renowned for their political adroitness and lobbying skill." Life has demonstrated on numerous occasions that the influence of those forces should not be underestimated.

On this side of the Atlantic, too, in Western Europe, the intensifying desire for mutually beneficial cooperation with the Warsaw Pact countries is sometimes countered by groundless claims about Soviet military superiority and calls to build up the North Atlantic bloc's might, particularly by "modernizing" its tactical nuclear weapons. The greatest concern in this regard is voiced by London. Yet in present-day conditions this is total nonsense. And many Westerners realize that. When asked by British journalists for his attitude toward the plans to modernize short-range nuclear missiles, FRG Foreign Minister Genscher replied with some sarcasm: "You must be joking. Who is their target supposed to be? Lech Walesa?"

Indeed, one cannot but be bewildered that the question of nuclear "arms upgrading" is surfacing again at a period of an improvement in the European situation which is obvious to all, when both sides are strictly fulfilling the Soviet-U.S. Treaty on Intermediate-Range and Shorter-Range Missiles. The destruction of shorter-range missiles and launchers has already been completed. By the beginning of this year the USSR had eliminated more than four-fifths of its intermediate-range missiles and more than two-thirds of the launchers for them. The United States is also meeting its commitments in this respect.

Other serious problems which need to be resolved but are being resisted by the West are also being carried over into the new year. One such problem is the U.S.-NATO leadership's refusal to hold talks on the reduction of naval forces and the limitation of naval activity. This comes despite the fact that modern technical naval equipment, including deck-borne strike aircraft and long-range cruise missiles, enables naval forces to take an active part in offensive operations and to deliver strikes against targets deep inside enemy territory. In conditions when other types of armed forces are being reduced, this can only increase the destabilizing role of U.S. and NATO naval forces, whose size and combat capabilities significantly exceed the corresponding Warsaw Pact forces. The increasing naval might of the United States and NATO greatly exceeds the needs of protecting sea lanes, whose significance the West is so fond of talking about.

To justify the gamble on naval superiority, Washington is putting forward a patently farfetched thesis. Superiority is needed, it claims, because unlike the United States, which is a naval power, the Soviet Union is a "land power." That is said of a country whose state border runs along 13 seas with direct access to 2 oceans. But if you accept even for a minute this dubious U.S. viewpoint, to put it mildly, the inevitable question then is: What logic guides a maritime power claiming naval superiority which feels it necessary to be on equal terms with a land power on dry land? The United States avoids that question. But even here reality is beginning to prevail. London's THE OBSERVER notes that within NATO there is no longer the general belief that naval forces cannot be the object of talks.

Despite the fully justified hope for a better future, I still believe that it would be a grave mistake to count on the completely untroubled development of the international situation, both this year and in the final decade of the 20th century as a whole. The world is still not free of the political and military doctrines, strategies, and concepts which arose during the cold war years, the mountains of weapons stockpiled during those years, or the mistrust, misgivings, and fear—all those things which often underlie the emergence of dangerous crisis situations and armed conflicts. The final elimination of the gloomy legacy of the past and the further improvement of the political climate in the world will require purposeful efforts from all countries and all the peoples.

United States & Canada

U.S. Role in Nuclear Detection at Sea Urged

PM0901145190 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 7 Jan 90 Morning Edition p 5

[A. Anichkin article: "Scientists Need Politicians' Support"]

[Text] When Soviet and U.S. leaders met in Malta, a small group of people in Washington—Soviet and U.S. scientists—summed up the final results of an experiment on which depends the speed with which an agreement on strategic offensive arms reduction can be reached.

IZVESTIYA (No 192, 1989) has already talked about the joint Soviet-U.S. nongovernmental experiment last summer in the Black Sea off Yalta, where specialists from the USSR Academy of Sciences and the USSR Ministry of Atomic Power Engineering and Industry, together with experts from the U.S. Council for the Protection of Natural Resources, tried for the first time "to detect," using U.S. and Soviet equipment, nuclear warheads on board the newest Soviet missile cruiser, the *Slava*, which had been made available especially for this purpose. Scientists flew over it in a helicopter, "scanned" it with instruments from the shore and another vessel, and, lastly, placed detectors right on the missile launcher housing. The results made it possible to immediately conclude that the tests of long-range and contact equipment to detect nuclear warheads may be considered the first step toward developing a practical system of technical monitoring [kontrol].

Now, at a new meeting following careful analysis of the data obtained at that time, the participants in the Yalta experiment have in all confidence been able to say the following in a joint statement issued by Thomas Cochrane and Academician V.L. Barsukov, the Soviet and U.S. delegation heads: The development of a long-range and contact system for monitoring [kontrol] nuclear weapons on board surface vessels is possible—and possible, evidently, within a short timeframe. A.G. Mokerov, one of the scientific leaders of the international experiment and deputy director of the USSR Academy of Sciences Center of Program Studies, said:

"Our problem now is as follows. Our experiments are of a nongovernmental character. Although scientists from major scientific centers which fulfill orders for the USSR and U.S. Governments are involved in them, the defense ministries and other state departments must now be involved at the current stage. It may be necessary to establish a special government-financed targeted program. That is why in the statement signed in Washington we urged the U.S. and USSR Governments to give maximum support and assistance to our efforts to research the methods and means of monitoring [kontrol] nuclear arms."

"We are also concerned by the lack of reciprocity regarding the possibilities of further experiments using warships," said V.I. Lebedev, a scientific leader in this field and head of a Kurchatov Atomic Energy Institute laboratory. "In the Black Sea the USSR Defense Ministry took a colossal step toward openness. This was a demonstration of trust in the Soviet and U.S. scientists' joint work, but this trust will be hard to maintain if the U.S. Navy leadership does not agree to eliminate this asymmetry in practical experiments to verify [proverka] our apparatus. Tests are needed to confirm the results obtained in the Black Sea, now involving U.S. ships—even without Soviet representatives on board. Unfortunately— and U.S. scientists, incidentally, share this regret—we are not meeting with any readiness from the Department of the Navy and other U.S. Government departments to conduct this kind of experiment.

"The equipment we have developed represents technical backup for the Geneva talks," V.I. Lebedev continued. "Scientists have shown that verification [kontrol] is possible, politicians now need to believe this and reach agreement as to how it will be organized. Our methods [razrabotki] are flexible enough and enable us, we believe, to meet the demands for the reliable detection and identification of a nuclear warhead on board a surface vessel and, on the other hand, the preservation of state secrets (such as, for instance, the weapon's constructional features)."

Given the requisite level of political trust, scientists involved in the Black Sea experiment believe that, using technical means, it is possible to back up this trust and to guarantee that both sides are fulfilling their pledges.

State Department Statement on Angola Criticized

LD0901164890 Moscow TASS in English 1625 GMT 9 Jan 90

["Who Hampers National Accord in Angola?"—TASS headline]

[Text] Moscow January 9 TASS—By TASS diplomatic correspondent:

The U.S. State Department issued the other day a strange statement on developments in Angola. It presents in excessive detail the U.S. view of the events in that country but shamefacedly passes in silence the question who is to blame for disrupting the cease-fire agreed upon in Gbadolite last June.

It was the UNITA [National Union for the Total Independence of Angola] rebel grouping that, with the United States' connivance, grossly violated the Gbadolite agreement and escalated hostilities to secure for itself a stronger say in negotiations.

The continuous U.S. military aid that pushes UNITA onto the path of war is the source of unflagging tension in Angola and the main obstacle to the achievement of national accord in the country.

The Soviet Union believes that the intra-Angolan conflict can and must be settled by political means. In this respect, the Soviet Union's stance coincides with those of African countries, the non-alignment movement and many Western countries.

The Soviet Union supported the Gbadolite accords and considers them to be a feasible basis for the development of intra-Angolan dialogue aimed at establishing peace and stability in Angola.

A political settlement of the intra-Angolan problem can become a reality only if foreign intervention into sovereign Angola's internal affairs is ended.

The Soviet Union is ready to contribute to the peaceful development of events in Angola and expects the same from the United States.

Northeast Asia

U.S. Envoy to S. Korea Cited on Troop Cuts

LD0801181290 Moscow TASS in English 1752 GMT 8 Jan 90

[Text] Tokyo January 8 TASS—The United States should withdraw its troops from the south of the Korean peninsula, but the withdrawal should be implemented gradually. U.S. Ambassador to South Korea Donald Gregg stated this in Kwangju today, YONHAP NEWS AGENCY reports.

The American ambassador's statement is just one of the numerous and quite contradictory statements and reports published by the media of late about the further destiny of the 43-thousand strong Pentagon corps deployed in the south of the Korean peninsula.

The United States and South Korea are about to conclude an agreement on the withdrawal of 5,000-6,000 U.S. servicemen this year, YONHAP NEWS AGENCY reported the other day.

This is associated with the demands of U.S. congressmen and cuts in the U.S. military budget.

The newspaper KYUNGHYANG SHINMUN writes that from 1991 U.S.-South Korean Team Spirit Exercises will be held once every two years and will be scaled down. Some 200,000 servicemen participated every year in these exercises so far.

Meanwhile, during the visit of head of the Seoul administration No Tae-u to the United States in October of last year, President of the United States George Bush made the assurances that U.S. troops will be staying in the south of the Korean peninsula as long as South Korea wants this, and will continue to contribute to the ensurance of peace and stability in the region.

Past Wednesday [3 January] South Korean Defence Minister Yi Sang-hun asserted that Washington and Seoul at present have no intentions to discuss the reduction of the number of U.S. troops in South Korea. With reference to government sources, YONHAP reports that the United States and South Korea study the question of moving U.S. marines from the Japanese island of Okinawa to the south of the Korean peninsula.

Near East & South Asia

Shevardnadze, Iran's Va'ezi Discuss Nakhichevan

LD0901184690 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1700 GMT 9 Jan 90

[Text] Moscow, 9 Jan (TASS)—Today Eduard Shevardnadze, member of CPSU Central Committee Politburo and the USSR foreign minister, has received Mahmud Va'ezi, Iranian deputy foreign minister, who came to Moscow and delivered a personal message from 'Ali Akbar Velayati, Iranian foreign minister.

During the meeting, which was held in an amicable and constructive atmosphere, questions of Soviet-Iranian relations and bilateral cooperation were discussed. It was ascertained with satisfaction that the Soviet Union and Iran, following the accords reached between Mikhail Gorbachev and 'Ali Akbar Hashemi-Rafsanjani in June 1989, are consistently making progress in strengthening neighborly relations and mutual understanding and are imparting a dynamic forward character to their contacts in various spheres.

Also under examination were certain topical international and regional problems.

Particular attention was devoted to the problem of a political settlement between Iran and Iraq. The Soviet side stressed the importance of further advancing the negotiating process with a view to achieving mutually acceptable solutions on the basis on UN Security Council Resolution 598. The positive Iranian view was contained in the message from 'Ali Akbar Velayati on the possibility of holding a meeting of the foreign ministers of the USSR, Iran, and Iraq. In connection with this, the Soviet side reported that Iraq has also agreed to hold such a meeting. The sides agreed to begin to study the matter practically.

There was a thorough discussion on the situation in Afghanistan and surrounding areas. The need for a political solution to the Afghan problem on the basis of national reconciliation and the creation of a broadbased government representing the interests of the whole Afghan society was noted.

The Soviet side dwelt on the latest events on the border between the two countries in the region of the Nakhichevan ASSR [Autonomous Soviet Socialist Republic]. The sides stated their readiness to develop person-to-person communications and border communications, including trade and cultural exchanges and contacts between relatives.

The sides agreed to continue consultations on all the questions discussed.

On the same day Lev Voronin, deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers, and Mahmud Va'ezi had a meeting. During the conversation, held in an atmosphere of mutual understanding, questions concerning the state and prospects of Soviet-Iranian commercial-economic and scientific-technical cooperation and also some other questions of mutual interest were discussed. The sides expressed mutual interest in exerting future efforts for the practical implementation of the accords reached in the course of the talks between Mikhail Gorbachev and 'Ali Akbar Hashemi-Rafsanjani, held in Moscow in June 1989.

Naser Heirani-Nobari, Iranian ambassador to the USSR, took part in the conversation.

IRNA Report

LD0901182590 Tehran IRNA in English 1713 GMT 9 Jan 90

[Text] Moscow, Jan. 9, IRNA—Iran's Deputy Foreign Minister Mahmud Va'ezi today discussed with Soviet Foreign Minister Eduard Shevardnadze a wide range of topics, from mutual ties and the Afghan issue to peace talks with the Iraqi regime and the current unrest in the Soviet part of Azerbaijan.

Shevardnadze, terming the year 1989 as a 'turning point' in Tehran-Moscow relations, said the most important event of the year was the state visit to the Soviet Union of Hojjat ol-Eslam Akbar Hashemi-Rafsanjani, which highlighted the significance of bilateral ties.

The two sides also expressed satisfaction over the 'ever-growing' trend in mutual ties and agreed that the issue of Afghanistan should be resolved as per the wishes of Afghan Muslims.

On the current wave of Muslim demonstrations in Soviet Azerbaijan, where people are demanding more facilities for travel to Iran, Va'ezi announced the Islamic Republic's readiness to facilitate cross border contacts with Soviet Muslims.

He said the presence of an Iranian consular delegation in Baku, the capital of Soviet Azerbaijan, proved Iran's readiness in this regard.

Turning to the stalled peace talks, Va'ezi held the Iraqi regime responsible for the impasse in the negotiations, saying that the Ba'athist regime in Baghdad was raising irrelevant issues in a bid to procrastinate the enforcement of U.N. Resolution 598.

The Iranian deputy foreign minister arrived here on January 6 at the head of a delegation.

Israel's Weizman To Meet With Shevardnadze

TA1001052390 Jerusalem Domestic Service in English 0500 GMT 10 Jan 90

[Text] Science Minister Weizman will meet today with Soviet Foreign Minister Shevardnadze in Moscow. Political sources in Jerusalem say the meeting goes against the directive of Prime Minister Shamir that Weizman should avoid all meetings with Kremlin leaders during his trip to the Soviet Union.

Sharayev-Led CPSU Delegation Departs for Syria

PM0901145390 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 9 Jan 90 Second Edition p 5

[TASS report: "Interparty Ties"]

[Text] A delegation of CPSU party officials headed by L.G. Sharayev, member of the CPSU Central Auditing Commission and first secretary of Nikolayev Ukrainian Communist Party Oblast Committee, left for Damascus 8 January in accordance with the plan for ties between the CPSU and the Syrian Ba'th Party.

Sub-Saharan Africa

Envoy Cited on 'Military Specialists' in Angola

EA0901212490 Dakar PANA in English 1705 GMT 9 Jan 90

[Text] Luanda, 9 Jan (ANGOP/PANA)—The Soviet ambassador in Angola, Vladimir Kazimirov, on Tuesday [9 January] in Luanda said that "there are no Soviets in any combat zones in Angola".

Kazimirov was responding to UNITA [National Union for the Total Independence of Angola] allegations that Soviet troops and Portuguese mercenaries are fighting side by side with the Angolan Armed Forces (FAPLA) [People's Armed Forces for the Liberation of Angola] in southern Angola.

He, however, told ANGOP that it is no "secret that in Angola, there are Soviet military specialists."

Speaking on reports by some Western mass media about the presence of Soviet troops in southern Angola, Kazimirov regretted that these news agencies never get their information from reliable sources.

THE FRENCH NEWS AGENCY recently reported that four Soviet military specialists were injured while fighting in southern Angola.

East Europe

Shevardnadze Interviewed on Visit to Romania

PM0901113390 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 9 Jan 90 Morning Edition p 4

[M. Yusin dispatch from Bucharest, with an interview with USSR Foreign Minister E.A. Shevardnadze in the aircraft en route to Moscow from Bucharest on 6 January: "Nine Hours in Bucharest. IZVESTIYA's Diplomatic Correspondent Accompanied E.A. Shevardnadze on His Trip to Romania"]

[Text] Bucharest-Moscow—The 6 January visit by USSR Foreign Minister E.A. Shevardnadze to the Romanian capital was unusually brief, lasting just 9 hours. Nonetheless, judging by statements by Romanian officials and commentaries in the local press, the arrival of the head of Soviet diplomacy in Bucharest was one of the main events of the new year for Romania.

Primarily as a symbol. A symbol of the Soviet Union's unconditional support for the new Romanian leadership. It is indicative that E.A. Shevardnadze was one of the first foreign visitors to Romania following the tumultuous December events. He was "beaten to it" only by Hungarian Foreign Minister G. Horn and French National Assembly Speaker L. Fabius.

Was it to be expected that all the questions perturbing both sides would be successfully discussed in depth and detail during the few hours which the extremely tight schedule allowed for E.A. Shevardnadze's conversations with the Romanian leaders? This was hardly the visit's main objective. Even a few days prior to its beginning, the foreign press described the forthcoming trip as being primarily a "familiarization" visit. I think that this appraisal can be accepted. It was indeed a question of familiarization—familiarization with the new people who have suddenly appeared on the Romanian political horizon; familiarization with the unclear, contradictory, unstable, and unpredictable political situation in the country....

The familiarization did take place. All the indications are that both sides are pleased. "Never before have I experienced such emotions as I did just before this trip," E.A. Shevardnadze admitted at a press conference held in Bucharest's Intercontinental Hotel right after the conclusion of the talks. "Now I feel perfectly satisfied and relieved." It was only later, on board the aircraft en route to Moscow, that the minister returned to this thought in conversation with the Soviet journalists accompanying him: "There was a lot of skepticism before the visit. The conversations which took place instilled confidence that Romania's new leadership will succeed in consolidating its positions and coping with the difficulties. The Romanian leaders created a most favorable impression—they are erudite and modern people with analytical minds." The contrast with Ceausescu and his "team" is striking: "A completely different intellectual potential, cultural and educational standards.... After talks with Ceausescu, I always departed with a heavy feeling. I would go even further: Both I and Gorbachev were simply organically incompatible with the former dictator's personality."

The minister and the Foreign Ministry staffers who traveled with him and with whom we managed to chat were unanimous in the opinion that the visit proved successful in every regard.

The talks in Bucharest proved that the Romanian leaders are fully determined to break with the past not only in domestic policies but also in the international arena, putting an end to the growing isolation in which their country was finding itself as democracy advanced in neighboring states. "I do not think I would be revealing a secret if I told you: The Romanian interlocutors declared their readiness to lift the numerous well-known reservations on human rights and humanitarian questions made by Ceausescu at the Vienna meeting and other forums. In my view, this is a very important event—a significant step forward along the path toward deepening the European process. In our opinion, the Romanian revolution and the changes in the country's policy associated with it will help to accelerate the convening of an all-European conference," the Soviet minister declared at the press conference.

The future of CEMA and the Warsaw Pact was another aspect of the talks. Replying to a question about the stand taken by the Romanian side on this problem, E.A. Shevardnadze said: "We arrived at the joint opinion that it is necessary to bring both organizations up to date. This especially applies to CEMA—it needs to be fundamentally reconstructed and to be given a fresh breath of life. As regards the Warsaw Pact, we reached agreement that consultations must continue on the alliance's gradual transformation from the viewpoint of its further politicization. In this regard, by the way, our point of view encounters understanding in the West—people there agree with the idea that it is necessary to politicize the existing military blocs." The likelihood of Romania's withdrawal from the Warsaw Pact or any other steps which might arouse the Soviet Union's concern was not raised at the talks, and this rebutted several forecasts carried by foreign mass media just before the visit.

Another question which naturally could not have been avoided by the several hundred journalists attending the press conference was: "How will the Soviet Union perceive the domestic political changes in Romania—the emergence of new parties, most of which do not espouse positions of socialism, and the appearance of slogans like 'Down with Communism!' on walls in Bucharest. Is a possible change in Romania's ideological orientation not likely to result in a split within the Warsaw Pact?"

The essence of E.A. Shevardnadze's reply boiled down to this: As far as the Soviet Union is concerned, any dictatorship is unacceptable regardless of the ground on which it has developed—whether communist, if it is passed off as communist, or bourgeois. It is up to the Romanian people to decide what parties will function in the country, and we do respect and will continue to respect their will. We are ready to recognize the system and structure the Romanian people establish. As regards the Warsaw Pact: It does not necessarily have to be associated with ideology. There are common national and geopolitical interests of the states, and for as long as they remain and NATO remains in existence, the need for the Warsaw Pact also remains."

Journalists showed keen interest in the question of reaction to the Romanian events in Moldavia. It is well known that people in the West made the following forecast: Romania's liberation from Ceausescu and the establishment of a democratic regime would result in an outburst of nationalism in the neighboring Soviet republic.

Conversations with Foreign Ministry representatives indicated that this question was touched upon only in general terms during the talks. The Romanian leadership, busy solving the country's most complex domestic problems, expressed no special desire to raise this thorny question. It confirmed that Romania has no territorial claims against the USSR. Both sides agreed on the need to create conditions for the development of ties between the population of Romania and Moldavia. E.A. Shevardnadze announced that accord was reached on establishing in the near future a less stringent visa regime along the Soviet-Romanian border (similar to the one now in force along the USSR's borders with Hungary and Poland). This will lift the barriers to the development of free contacts between residents of border regions which have existed for many years....

One cannot fail to mention another aspect on which E.A. Shevardnadze and his Romanian colleague S. Celak dwelt on several occasions during the press conference. Were there any contacts between the Soviet Union and forces in opposition to Ceausescu prior to the beginning of the uprising? The foreign press widely circulated a story that talks about details of the forthcoming seizure of power were supposedly held in Moscow. The Soviet minister denied these reports. As E.A. Shevardnadze declared, the Romanian National Salvation Front did not exist prior to the beginning of the uprising. Therefore there could have been no contacts between the Front's representatives and the Soviet Union. The people's movement developed spontaneously, it was neither prepared nor planned in advance, whether in Bucharest or in Moscow.

We were already in the aircraft when I addressed my last few questions to the foreign minister.

[Yusin] Did the new Romanian leaders ask the Soviet Union for military assistance when resistance by Ceausescu's supporters was at its fiercest and the situation appeared critical?

[Shevardnadze] No, there were no such requests.

[Yusin] Suppose the National Salvation Front leaders had nonetheless asked for military intervention for the sake of saving the Romanian revolution, what would the Soviet Union's reply have been?

[Shevardnadze] We would not have started bringing troops in. Such a step by the Soviet Union would have negated the principles of new political thinking. We have learned enough from bitter experience—the harsh lessons of Czechoslovakia and Afghanistan should not vanish without a trace. No such thing should recur. There is no justification for armed intervention in another country's affairs. I think that the new Romanian leadership has a correct perception of our position.

[Yusin] How, in your view, can one explain the fact that representatives of some states, primarily France and the United States, stubbornly tried to persuade the USSR to use military force to defend the Romanian revolution?

[Shevardnadze] This is a complex question. As regards the United States (I mean only the specific administration spokesmen who made such statements), judging by everything, the reason is this: Involvement by Soviet troops in the Romanian events could have distracted world public attention from the U.S. invasion of Panama.

As regards France, I do not rule out that this country's leaders, when expressing such proposals, were guided predominantly by sincere feelings of solidarity with the Romanian people. But there is no justification for even raising the question. It is not in line with our principles. We are convinced that it is up to the people alone to decide their country's future.

Romania Announces Foreign Policy 'Turning Point'

PM0901152590 Moscow SELSKAYA ZHIZN in Russian 9 Jan 90 p 3

[TASS report under the general heading "SELSKAYA ZHIZN Teletype"]

[Text] The Romanian Foreign Ministry has issued a statement saying that the victory of the revolution in the country, which led to the overthrow of tyranny and the winning of freedom, marked a historic turning point for the Romanian people in the foreign policy sphere too.

Romania was and is a European country. Its people have always wanted to develop friendly ties and cooperation with European countries. In connection with the Romanian people's will the National Salvation Front Council program envisages that the country's foreign policy will serve to develop good-neighborliness, friendship, peace, and the process of creating a single Europe and a common home for all the continent's peoples.

Romanian Envoy Departs, Replacement Appointed

PM0901115190 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 9 Jan 90 Morning Edition p 4

[TASS report: "Ambassador's Departure"]

[Text] Romanian Ambassador Ion Bucur has left Moscow.

New Ambassador

AU0901164790 Bucharest Domestic Service in Romanian 1600 GMT 9 Jan 90

[Text] By decree of the Council of the NSF [National Salvation Front], Vasile Sandru has been appointed Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary Ambassador of Romania to the Soviet Union replacing Ion Bucur who has been recalled.

Rakowski Sees Need for 'Strong Left-Wing Party'

PM0901105990 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 5 Jan 90 Second Edition p 5

[TASS report: "Crucial Year"]

[Text] Warsaw, 4 Jan—The year 1989 was crucial for Poland and 1990 will be crucial for left-wing forces, M. Rakowski, first secretary of the PZPR [Polish United Workers Party] Central Committee, stressed in a statement published today in the newspaper TRYBUNA LUDU. The 11th PZPR Congress is going to be held soon and this, I am sure, will be followed by the constituent congress of a new party of Polish left-wing forces, he said.

Summing up the results of the election of congress delegates, M. Rakowski said that, contrary to pessimistic predictions, 1,132,221 people took part in these elections—or 57.7 percent of all party members.

Poland needs a strong left-wing party: That is the opinion of the more than 1 million party members who took part in the election of delegates. A similar opinion is expressed by the more well known, farsighted leaders of the "Solidarity" camp, M. Rakowski pointed out.

The road to a party of democratic socialism will be long and hard, the first secretary of the PZPR Central Committee indicated. Our main task is to concretize the party's immediate objectives. It must offer the people a socialist alternative to both the Stalinist model and the primitive capitalism of the 19th century.

The time has now come for real action, M. Rakowski said in conclusion. We still have a chance of becoming an influential party in Poland, a party capable of playing a creative, effective role in a pluralist democratic system, a party which the Polish people need.

Shevardnadze, Poland's Skubiszewski Exchange Cables

PM0901163990 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 6 Jan 90 Morning Edition p 4

[TASS report: "Exchange of Telegrams"]

[Text] On the occasion of the 45th anniversary of the establishment of diplomatic relations between the Soviet Union and the Polish Republic, the two countries' foreign ministers have exchanged telegrams of congratulation.

E.A. Shevardnadze's telegram points out that the bonds of friendship, alliance, and all-around cooperation which have taken shape between our countries and which are founded on the principles of equal rights, respect for sovereignty, noninterference in each other's internal affairs, mutual advantage, and mutual responsibility are in accordance with the fundamental interests of the Soviet and Polish peoples.

K. Skubiszewski's telegram emphasizes that the Government of the Polish Republic attaches paramount significance to friendly and good-neighborly relations between our states, and the changes taking place in Poland and the Soviet Union create good prospects for mutual cooperation. This was confirmed by Prime Minister T. Mazowiecki's recent visit to the USSR, in the course of which a program was defined for the development of mutually advantageous, partnership relations. The two states' cooperation as allies has the purpose of strengthening mutual security and the well-being of the Polish and Soviet peoples, as well as peace and security in Europe and throughout the planet.

Aboimov, Polish Ambassador Discuss Cooperation

PM0901165390 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 28 Dec 89 Moscow Evening Edition p 6

[TASS report under the general heading: "Official Reports"]

[Text] USSR Deputy Foreign Minister I.P. Aboimov received Polish Ambassador to the USSR S. Ciosek on 27 December.

During the conversation, there was an exchange of information on certain questions concerning bilateral cooperation in the spheres of foreign policy and the economy.

Polish Spokesman Outlines Foreign Policy

LD0801190990 Moscow TASS in English 1848 GMT 8 Jan 90

[Text] Warsaw Janurary 8 TASS—In relations with the Soviet Union and countries of central-Eastern Europe, which are most important for Poland, it will strive to uphold the principles of sovereignty and equality, respect for the interests and observance of existing agreements, including those within the framework of the Warsaw Treaty and the CMEA, Polish Foreign Ministry Press Spokesman Stefan Staniszewski told a press conference today. In its policy vis-a-vis the West, Poland strives to strengthen its position in Europe by maintaining intensive political contacts at many levels and fostering conditions for decentralized economic and financial cooperation.

Poland's approach to European security problems will be to strive for a stable situation on the continent while expanding the areas of cooperation within the framework of the process started by the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe.

Of importance in this respect will be actions to reduce the role of the military factor, above all by stimulating the transformation of the Warsaw Treaty and NATO into political-defensive alliances.

Reaffirming commitment to the allied obligations, Tadeusz Mazowiecki's government favours confining the Warsaw Treaty's role to purely defensive functions and ensuring external security of its members without interfering in domestic political and economic affairs, the Foreign Ministry spokesman said.

Europe's present security fabric relies above all on military alliances and so the existence of the two military blocs for the foreseeable future is necessary to maintain stability on the continent of Europe.

At the present stage they are in a position to contribute to security in Europe. On the other hand, the actions now being taken to enhance the atmosphere of trust and build a single Europe in the future objectively lead us to what is our final objective: carrying out such a change in the conditions of European security that will make the two military blocs lose their raison-d'etre.

Already now one can see in East-West political relations a gradual disappearance of enmity and, in military relations, a waning sense of threat.

Poland wishes to see the Warsaw Treaty being capable, while fulfilling its role of guarantor of external security of the signatory countries, of being simultaneously utilized for stimulating the process of disarmament, a European rapprochement and setting in place an effective system of concerted security in Europe, Staniszewski said.

Briefing Views Poland's European, Bloc Ties

PM0901135990 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian
7 Jan 90 Morning Edition p 4

[TASS report: "Press Conference in Warsaw"]

[Text] Warsaw, 6 Jan—"The socialist camp's world policy is changing in a fundamental way. Strictly speaking, this camp has ceased to exist, it has broken up. I believe that we will treat various 'Third World' countries normally, without creating privileges for them," Polish Government press spokeswoman M. Nezabitowska said at Friday's news conference here in response to a question regarding Poland's attitude to Angola and other countries politically allied to the socialist camp.

Commenting on Z. Brzezinski's thesis and—at his prompting—that of the Polish press regarding the advisability of setting up a Polish-Czechoslovak federation, the government press spokesman indicated the prematurity of such a plan. However, she stressed that Poland reacted with great interest to the idea of forming a large European confederation involving East European states voiced in the French president's New Year address. At the same time she did not rule out a rapprochement between Poland and Czechoslovakia on political and economic platforms in the course of T. Mazowiecki's scheduled visit to Prague in the near future.

Explaining the Polish delegation's stance in the UN voting on U.S. intervention in Panama (it abstained during the voting in favor of the resolution), M. Nezabitowska drew journalists' attention to the knotty nature of the conflict in this region.

Briefing them on the socioeconomic situation in the country, she announced, in particular, that the decision to close the Gdansk shipyard has been rescinded. A joint stock company created there will tackle the future of the enterprise.

SED-PDS Organizational Restructuring Examined

PM0901152190 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian
9 Jan 90 Second Edition p7

[Own correspondent M. Podklyuchnikov dispatch under the rubric "Life in the Fraternal Parties": "Apparatus Cutbacks"]

[Text] Berlin, 8 Jan—In line with the new working conditions, the Socialist Unity Party of Germany-Party of Democratic Socialism [SED-PDS] is reorganizing the structure of its leading bodies. The aim of this is to create an efficient but smaller apparatus.

At the end of last year, the Board Presidium took the decision to eliminate the departments which existed in the former SED Central Committee. Commissions on party organizational work, party instruction, the political system, the mass media, science and culture, ecology, and international relations have been formed in their place.

All the commissions operate on social principles and, as a result, the number of apparatus personnel being released from their duties is being sharply reduced. The commissions include workers, members of peasant cooperatives, scientists, and other specialists. Small working groups made up of party workers released from their duties are being set up under the SED-PDS Board to assist the commissions.

A meeting was held the other day between members of the SED-PDS Board and representatives of regional and municipal party organizations, at which the commission on the political system was formed. It is headed on the basis of social principles by Wolfgang Berghofer, deputy party chairman. The commission's tasks will include that of drawing up fundamental positions regarding the formation of the GDR political system.

Five working circles are being formed under the commission. They will discuss questions of renewing and forming the political system, such as: party pluralism and civic initiatives; state legal policy; policy toward the church; and also policy in security and defense matters.

The commission will be involved in elaborating the viewpoint of the SED-PDS faction in the GDR People's Chamber, and also the party's stance at the "roundtable" sessions, at which 16 parties and social organizations and groups are represented.

SED-PDS' Gysi Seeks 'Single Peaceful Europe'

PM0901160790 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian
9 Jan 90 Second Edition p 5

[TASS report: "Election Platform"]

[Text] Berlin, 8 Jan—The Socialist Unity Party of Germany-Party of Democratic Socialism [SED-PDS] has officially entered the election campaign. A report on the party's election platform has been delivered by party chairman Gysi.

We support a sovereign GDR offering a socialist alternative to capitalism on German soil. We seek a German-German association within an all-European confederation, not a Europe limited by the NATO framework but a single peaceful Europe stretching from the Urals to the Atlantic. We do not want to promote the political destabilization of the continent or the failure of restructuring in other socialist countries, Gysi noted.

A united Europe can become a reality only with a strong European left, and thus only with a strong SED-PDS. Our party advocates the creation of a single broad front against right-wing radicalism. It cannot be limited to the GDR and must therefore be international in character—to include the democratic forces of the FRG and West Berlin. Only together can we prevent the further growth of neo-Nazism.

We are on the path from the SED toward a party of democratic socialism which will express the interests of the broadest circles of the country's population, the SED-PDS leader noted.

TASS Notes Growth of Neo-Nazism in GDR

LD0801222290 Moscow TASS in English 2135 GMT 8 Jan 90

[Text] Berlin January 9 TASS—By TASS correspondent Sergey Ryabikin:

The spread of Neo-Nazism in the German Democratic Republic gives rise to serious public concern. Monuments and walls of houses are smeared with Neo- Nazi slogans. More such cases take place in addition to the known cases in Berlin and Gera, Goerlitz, Pirna, Dresden and Leipzig.

Neo-Nazi slogans were discovered in a number of places past weekend. The signs "Turks out", "Russians out", "republicans are coming", were daubed in a car of the Berlin tube.

Swastikas and SS signs as well as the demands "hang all reds", "heil Hitler" slogan and calls to enter the Neo-Nazi Republican Party appeared on the walls in Bautzen.

Representatives of the civic movement Democracy Now K. Weiss told reporters on Monday that there are at least 1.5 thousand Neo-Nazis in the GDR and that Nazis pose serious danger.

The GDR Government and the criminal police exert efforts to reveal such cases. Thousands of leaflets and copies of newspapers with Nazi propaganda have been confiscated. On Monday GDR frontier guards barred the entry to Berlin to Franz Schoenhuber, chairman of the Neo-Nazi Republican Party, when he tried to cross into the GDR capital from West Berlin.

CPCZ Holds First Plenum Since Shakeup

PM0901161990 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 9 Jan 90 First Edition p 3

[TASS report: "CPCZ Central Committee Plenum"]

[Text] Prague, 8 Jan—A plenum of the Czechoslovak Communist Party [CPCZ] Central Committee has been held here. It is the first since the extraordinary CPCZ Congress.

A report was delivered by L. Adamec, chairman of the CPCZ. A new correlation of political forces and a new pluralistic power structure, in which the party is one component, has been set up.

Delivering a report on building a new type of party and creating its apparatus, V. Mohorita, first secretary of the CPCZ Central Committee, stressed that the CPCZ should become a party of free-thinking free people united by a desire to create a happy and socially just society for all.

The proposed size of the apparatus should be cut by more than 70 percent, the speaker stressed. Its structure will change fundamentally. He revealed that 130,000 people had left the CPCZ. The date for convening the next, 18th, party congress remains open for the time being.

On a show of hands the plenum elected the CPCZ Central Committee's Political Executive Committee (a new organ replacing the former CPCZ Central Committee Presidium). Its members include the party chairman, the CPCZ Central Committee first secretary, and three Central Committee secretaries.

F. Adamek, J. Machalik, and O. Saling were elected CPCZ Central Committee secretaries.

CSSR's Havel Sends Thanks for Message

PM0901140190 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 6 Jan 90 Morning Edition p 4

[CSSR President Vaclav Havel telegram "To the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium"]

[Text] Esteemed Friends,

I thank you for your congratulations. I also wish that relations between the CSSR and the Soviet Union may be friendly and mutually beneficial and significantly help to strengthen peace in Europe and throughout the world.

I for my part will do everything possible within my power.

[Signed] Vaclav Havel, president of the CSSR.

Ryzhkov Meets With Bulgaria's Mladenov

LD0901154390 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1428 9 Jan 90

[Text] Sofia, 9 Jan (TASS)—A meeting between N.I. Ryzhkov and P. Mladenov, general secretary of the BCP [Bulgarian Communist Party] Central Committee, chairman of the PRB [Peoples Republic of Bulgaria] State Council, took place in Sofia on 8 January.

During an exchange of views, a number of topical problems of both countries' internal lives and issues of bilateral cooperation and the international situation was touched upon. A high evaluation was given to the development of relations between both fraternal parties.

It was noted that the social processes that are taking place in the USSR and the PRB are a phenomenon of the same type opening favorable opportunities for qualitatively perfecting Soviet-Bulgarian relations. In this connection, the great importance of a search for new and promising ways to solve both countries' topical problems of development and the need to restructure economic interaction between the Soviet Union and Bulgaria on the basis of the socialist market mechanism was stressed. This should invest bilateral cooperation with a new impulse and liberate it from the effect of the negative factors produced by an excessive centralization of economic links.

The interlocutors expressed the confidence that a humane and democratic socialism provides the answer to the challenge of time, and makes it possible to improve radically the socioeconomic, cultural, ecological, and also international living conditions of peoples.

Touching upon the role of the Council of Mutual Economic Assistance in developing cooperation between socialist countries, P. Mladenov and N. Ryzhkov profferred a unanimous view to the effect that this organization retains its importance; its activity, however, needs sweeping renewal.

Participating in the conversation were G. Atanasov, BCP Central Committee Politburo member and PRB Council of Ministers chairman, and A. Lukanov, BCP Central Committee secretary, as well as V.V. Sharapov, USSR ambassador to the PRB.

On the same day, N.I. Ryzhkov met members and candidate members of the Politburo and secretaries of the BCP Central Committee.

Dwelling in detail on the situation in the PRB and on the tasks being tackled by the BCP and by the republic's party and state leadership, P. Mladenov stressed that in November 1989 the country had resolutely embarked on a path of perestroyka, and that in a short period of time political life in Bulgaria had acquired unprecedented dynamism.

The BCP Central Committee general secretary outlined the paths along which the party, together with the entire people, intends to resolve the problems which have built up as a result of many years of the rule of the system of administration by injunction. Setting for itself the goal of creating a democratic, law-governed state, the BCP has entered into a broad national discussion in the quest for the solutions which are necessary for this, and into "roundtable" negotiations in which the political opposition, too, is participating.

P. Mladenov also gave information about the decisions of the BCP Central Committee plenum held on 29 December. In particular he spoke on the restoration of the country's Turkish-speaking and Muslim population, and on the tense political situation which was created after that. In this context it was stressed that, as it overcomes the difficulties on the path of renewal, the party intends to firmly adhere to the policy of broad dialogue and of achieving nationwide accord.

N.I. Ryzhkov handed the Bulgarian comrades a cordial greeting from M.S. Gorbachev and the Soviet leadership. In the Soviet Union and in the CPSU, he said, the course of the democratic renewal in Bulgaria is being followed with great attention and interest, and the strategic goals which have been set in this connection are shared.

The USSR Council of Ministers chairman talked about the most important events in the political and socioeconomic life of the USSR; he noted that last year was a period of serious trials for Soviet society. It is important that it has entered the new year enriched with the experience of democratization, the skill to resolve acute problems in a new way, problems which life constantly poses. He thoroughly analyzed the peculiarities of restructuring processes in the Soviet Union, and the results of the Second Congress of USSR People's Deputies and session of the country's Supreme Soviet. Particular attention was paid to tasks and practical efforts to implement the government program, supported by the congress, for improving the country's economy.

Bulgarian comrades were informed about preparation which has begun in the CPSU for the main political event of the year—the 28th party congress. Soviet Communists connect great hopes for the renewal of the party with this event, and for giving it a new quality as a leading political organization of the people, capable in deed of heading the dynamic process of radical socialist renewal in the country.

As the meeting showed, thanks to the fact that both fraternal parties' strategic lines for perestroyka coincide, the development of friendly ties and traditional cooperation between the USSR and the PRB, the CPSU and the BCP, is obtaining a new solid basis.

Bulgarian Demonstrations Legacy of Zhivkov Era

PM0901141990 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 7 Jan 90 Morning Edition p 4

[Own correspondent A. Kapralov dispatch: "Difficult Hour for Bulgaria"]

[Text] Sofia—Numerous rallies were held once again on Friday in Sofia, Plovdiv, and Ruse, expressing disagreement with the State Council and Council of Ministers decision to remove the distortions regarding the country's Turkish-speaking and Muslim population.

A general strike was held in Kurdzhali. Plants stopped work, and transport was not operating. One of the strikers' main demands was for a national referendum to he held on the national question. At the same time, some of the people I have spoken to in recent days pointed out that a referendum is no way of solving such a complex problem, since the will of the majority could as a result be foisted on the minority—Bulgaria's Turkish-speaking population.

Unfortunately, the legacy of the former regime has had a serious effect on the consciousness of many people. The idea implanted by Zhivkov's propaganda that recognition of any ethnic, religious, or cultural minority whatever would jeopardize the country's territorial integrity and sovereignty has become deeply embedded.

Stanko Todorov, chairman of the Bulgarian National Assembly, spoke on television—thus, incidentally, responding to numerous demands from those involved in the rallies. Stressing that the Bulgarian State Council and Council of Ministers decision of 29 December 1989 was adopted in complete accordance with the Constitution, he pointed out that the tense situation that has taken shape in some areas of the country cannot fail to concern the entire Bulgarian people. The National Assembly is entitled to expect state bodies to take effective steps to maintain public order and the normal working of industrial enterprises and transport. Bulgaria's laws are binding on everyone. The National Assembly's stance, S. Todorov pointed out, is that it is intolerable to exploit the prevailing situation to put forward slogans resulting in separatism. It is inadmissible to exploit the national question in order to manipulate individual strata of the population.

It is important to realize that the State Council and Council of Ministers decision is based on the principle of free choice and voluntariness. We cannot prevent anyone from changing their name, just as we will not allow pressure to be put on those who want to keep their Bulgarian name. That is people's personal right, which is guaranteed by the law and must be defended by state bodies.

The National Assembly session that begins 15 January, S. Todorov announced, will initiate dialogue to elaborate an integrated national policy. That is the only way, the National Assembly chairman stressed, that national reconciliation and the building of a democratic, humane, law-governed power can be initiated. The session must set up a highly prestigious state commission headed personally by P. Mladenov, chairman of the State Council. Representatives of all sociopolitical forces and scientific and cultural figures, along with the population of individual regions of the country are to take part in the commission's work. Addressing all Bulgarian citizens and party and public organizations, S. Todorov urged them to contribute to reducing tension in the country and ensuring conditions for normal labor at this difficult hour for Bulgaria.

Bulgarian Decision Leads to Ethnic Unrest

*PM0901131590 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian
7 Jan 90 Second Edition p 7*

[Own correspondent L. Zhmyrev dispatch: "Situation in Bulgaria"]

[Text] Sofia, 6 Jan—Bulgaria is going through an alarming period. There have been rallies, meetings, strikes, protest petitions, threats of reprisals, and extremist attacks. Many enterprises in major cities in the south and east of the country have stopped work. In a number of places highways and railroads have been blocked. Feelings are running high on the streets, in the squares, in newspaper reports, and in radio and TV broadcasts.

The nationalities issue is the stumbling block on the path of the country's democratic transformations. The unrest was prompted in particular by the government's 29 December decision to restore the constitutional rights of Bulgaria's Turkish-speaking and Muslim population.

In connection with the rallies that have swept the Bulgarian capital, P. Mladenov, general secretary of the Bulgarian Communist Party Central Committee and chairman of the Bulgarian State Council, met yesterday with a group of citizens from Kurdzhali and Khaskovo, where the Turkish-speaking population is most concentrated.

During a frank talk the problems which have emerged and ways of solving them were discussed. For all the different opinions and positions there was a common conviction that the most important thing at present is to let people simmer down and to normalize the situation in the country. This can only be achieved through the honest and well-intentioned efforts of all Bulgarian citizens.

S. Todorov, chairman of the National Assembly, spoke on Bulgarian TV Friday. He called on the country's citizens to show tolerance and seek reconciliation and consensus and pointed to the need to elaborate a long-term, integrated, and comprehensively considered nationalities policy.

One of the steps which the National Assembly should take is to declare an amnesty on all people and any actions taken in connection with the enforced name change. He proposed setting up at the forthcoming Bulgarian parliament session a commission on ethnic problems which would be personally headed by the chairman of the State Council.

In connection with the rumors circulating among the population about possible armed outside intervention in events in Bulgaria, the Ministry of National Defense has issued a statement which says that Bulgaria's security and territorial integrity are reliably guaranteed. There are no grounds for alarm, much less for dramatizing the situation.

Bulgarian newspapers and the other mass media are expressing acute concern in connection with the wave of feelings that has swept the country on ethnic grounds.

MSZMP's Thurmer Sends Thanks to Gorbachev

LD0201212590 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1900 GMT 2 Jan 90

[Text] A telegram has arrived for Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev from Mr Thurmer, chairman of the Hungarian Socialist Workers Party [MSZMP], in which Thurmer expressed his gratitude for the congratulations sent in connection with his election to this post and his conviction that cooperation between the CPSU and the MSZMP will continue to develop to the benefot of the peoples of both countries.

West Europe

Azerbaijan Delegation Meets Turkish President

LD0901155190 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1151 GMT 9 Jan 90

[Text] Ankara, 9 Jan (TASS)—On Monday [8 January], Turgut Ozal, president of the Republic of Turkey, received a delegation from Soviet Azerbaijan led by A.N. Mutalibov, chairman of the Azerbaijan Soviet Socialist Republic Council of Ministers, which is here visiting.

Govorov Briefs France's Joxe on Civil Defense

PM0901162990 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 28 Dec 89 Second Edition p 1

[TASS report: "Conversation Held"]

[Text] The personnel of Soviet nonmilitarized civil defense formations are known as the first-aid soldiers. Their self-sacrificing actions during exercises in clearing up the aftereffects of various natural disasters, accidents, and catastrophes were described by Army General V.L. Govorov, chief of USSR Civil Defense and USSR deputy defense minister, when he met 27 December with French Minister of the Interior P. Joxe, who is visiting our country at the invitation of the USSR Ministry of Internal Affairs.

The guest inquired about the new approaches to the organization of protection measures. It was stressed that our civil defense system serves to save people in distress and help people develop the qualities necessary to make them ready to show steadfastness and courage in extreme conditions. It is based on commissions which have been set up everywhere under the auspices of soviets and executive organs, the job of which is to go to people's aid immediately when the situation demands it.

The participants in the conversation were unanimous that in the nuclear age everyone, regardless of the country in which he lives, should possess practical expertise in employing methods of individual and collective defense.

Belgium Sets 'Example' With Military Cuts

PM0901121990 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 4 Jan 90 Second Edition p 7

[Own correspondent V. Peresada report: "Good Example. Belgium: Armed Forces Reduction"]

[Excerpts] Brussels, 3 Jan—As the newspaper LA WALLONIE writes, a "thorough restructuring" of the Belgian Armed Forces General Staff will start in the next few days with the aim of "rationalizing its activity." [passage omitted]

What is dictating this policy? Essentially, the country's financial difficulties and the search for resources to reduce the budget deficit. But we have a right to ask the question: Would Belgium have decided to do this at the expense of the defense ministry's budget if it were not for the current improvements in the military and political climate on the European continent? I think not. It was no accident that National Defense Minister Guy Coeme welcomed the Soviet Union's unilateral initiative to reduce armed forces in Europe, calling them "serious, concrete steps." Nor is it fortuitous that Belgium spoke against the immediate modernization of NATO tactical nuclear missiles in Europe and advocated postponing a decision on this question.

Of course, the direct motives for the reduction of the country's military expenditure are economic. But it is obvious that they are being made with a general assessment of the situation in Europe and the development of East-West relations in mind: that is, they also have a political character. In this sense, little Belgium is setting a good example to its "senior partners" in NATO.

Italian CP Issues Major Reform Document

PM0901151390 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 6 Jan 90 Second Edition p 1

[TASS report: "Preparing for the Congress"]

[Text] Rome, 5 Jan—A. Occhetto, secretary general of the Italian Communist Party [PCI], gave a news conference to present to journalists the document "Beginning the Constituent Process for Creating a New Political Organization," prepared for the extraordinary party congress due to be held in Bologna 7-10 March.

The main task of the forthcoming congress, he said, is to obtain from party members a mandate to begin the constituent process for creating a new political organization. This proposal has nothing to do with the disbandment or dissolution of the PCI. On the contrary, the PCI will have to once more display boldness and creativity and attempt to answer the questions posed by current changes in the world.

Spanish Trade Contract 'Blocked' by U.S.

PM2912150989 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 28 Dec 89 Second Edition p 5

[Dispatch by own correspondent V. Volkov: "Cocom Ban"]

[Text] Madrid, 27 Dec—A contract signed by the Spanish firm Ceselsa for delivery to the USSR of equipment for an air traffic control system designed for installation at Moscow's Sheremetyevo Airport unexpectedly has been blocked. A veto on the deal was imposed by the U.S. representative in Cocom (coordination committee for the control of exports to socialist countries).

Reporting the ban, the influential Spanish newspaper EL PAIS writes that the embargo imposed by the U.S. representative who, incidentally, until recently was the U.S. ambassador to Madrid, is puzzling. After all, it is a case of equipment for a civilian airport, which is widely used in Spain.

Ceselsa specialists have told the newspaper's correspondent that the proposed package's inclusion of two computers from the U.S. firm Hewlett Packard, which are allegedly banned by Cocom organs for export to the socialist countries, served as the pretext for using the "straitjacket" in which Washington would like to "swaddle" this trade deal. But in the opinion of Spanish engineers, the Soviet Union has long had computers of this generation and makes extensive use of them.

The complexity of the situation in which the Spanish firm has found itself is also explained by the fact that the basic equipment, which makes up 96 percent of the total cost of the contract, has already been installed at Sheremetyevo Airport. It cannot operate, however, without the computers which are the electronic brain for the entire system.

The newspaper reports that the Spanish Ministries of Foreign Affairs, Defense, and Industry are conducting intense consultations with the U.S. Administration about unblocking the problem which has arisen. We shall see how successful these appeals are. But irrespective of the results, you cannot help asking: How long will trade deals between two sovereign states depend on the "say-so" of the White House?

Latin America & Caribbean

Panama President Meets Opposition Figures

LD0901120790 Moscow TASS in English 1158 GMT 9 Jan 90

[Text] Panama City January 9 TASS—Guillermo Endara, who took over as the president of Panama as a result of the U.S. invasion, has met Jorge Eduardo Ritter, former foreign minister of the republic, and Ernesto Perez Balladares, member of the Political Commission of the Revolutionary Democratic Party. The main topic of their talks was the creation of a legal democratic opposition in Panama.

Ritter told TASS that represented at the talks were not only the Revolutionary Democratic Party, but also all the forces that favour the implementation of the norms of a constitutional country.

Congress of People's Deputies

14 Dec Session Speeches, Proceedings Reported

On Stages of Economic Reform

*90US0305A Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian
16 Dec 89 Morning Edition pp 7-11*

[Report on speeches at Second Congress of USSR People's Deputies' 14 December morning session on "Stages of Economic Reform"]

[Excerpts] [Passage omitted] **A.V. Levashev**, lecturer at the Political Economy Department of the Leningrad Lensovet Engineering Institute (Kolpinskiy Territorial Electoral Okrug, Leningrad):

Dear comrade people's deputies, dear comrades present! Can it be said with all certainty that the current multiplicity of opinions and standpoints on various questions of economic reform constitutes the main problem for the creation of an integral concept? We are constantly being told about the negative consequences of this economic activity or the other and intimidated by various social consequences. Dear comrades, any economic activity has positive and negative consequences. The question is finding a solution with fewer minuses and a larger number of pluses. It is further necessary to determine the points at which we need to apply a power lever to overturn the mountain of problems confronting us. I consider such sore points those which determine an actual improvement in the life of the working man not in words but in reality. What is now the main obstacle to reform? The worker is not interested and cannot and does not wish to work well. Whatever we say about an increase in material incentives, they will not work until we produce more good commodities. How can our workman, foreman, or director learn to manufacture high-quality goods if at times he does not even know what they look like and if all high-quality commodities are made abroad? To break this vicious circle, we need to seek the speediest opening of our market and economy to world-level commodities and technology.

Much that is absolutely correct is being said about joint ventures and about the fact that present-day foreign economic relations are far more complex than simply the exchange of finished products. The main thing remains the same as 200 years ago—money; a single convertible ruble is needed for the market. Convertibility is easily introduced. This would take a week. The question lies elsewhere. Who overseas will want our rubles before the country has proved itself on the world market? No one.

We need to create additional conditions for the increased attractiveness of the ruble as a means of international payment. Such a condition is gold convertibility of the ruble, that is, its exchange for gold. Today we simply sell gold, comrades, like oil, timber, coal, and so forth. And we produce a great deal, incidentally. It should be used, as in Switzerland and South Africa, to support the stability of our currency. Yes, this would not be an ordinary step, but in our difficult economic situation there can be no ordinary steps. This would be a patriotic step. We would be exchanging the ruble not for dollars, francs, and Deutsche marks, slavishly ingratiating ourselves with foreign countries, but for our own gold, demand for which is growing steadily. Also of considerable importance is that the government would acquire a mechanism for influencing the exchange rate of its currency and would not farm it out wholly to profiteers and world currency market speculators.

Initially, it would be possible to additionally determine also a quantitative limitation on the functioning of the ruble on the world market. One hundred billion a year, let us suppose. Ruble convertibility would permit the removal of the problem of monetary reform and so-called superfluous money in the economy. Let them go abroad in exchange for any goods which come to us.

Of course, particular preparatory work is necessary. Catalogues of the commodities of well-known firms should be distributed and trips abroad by our managers organized via the ministries and departments.

We need to involve diplomacy also and to seek most-favored-nation conditions in trade for our country. In any event, we cannot drag out a solution of this question. Today's "wooden" ruble is literally pushing the union republics to introduction of their own currencies. Only a gold-backed ruble could guarantee that such exclusiveness does not occur. In addition, ruble convertibility will help really introduce competition. All this makes it possible to say that ruble convertibility is not the end of economic reform, as was heard in the government report, but a most important means for its success.

One further obstacle today is the fact that the working people do not see order at work. General disorganization and muddle reign, voluntarism thrives, and monetary resources are being used for purposes other than those intended. The answer is simple. Production today has no real boss. I would like to dwell on this question in some greater detail.

Normal modern production, that is, the production of goods for the market, always makes it possible to determine or separate three groups of economic interests: Those of the proprietor of the enterprise, the interests of the enterprise management, and the interests of the work force. There are, correspondingly, exponents of these interests: The interests of the work force are upheld currently by the work-force council, and the administration acts in the interests of enterprise management. I would ask you to consider that even if the director and the hired worker are artificially in the same trade union or are members of one and the same work-force council, their economic interests will, all the same, be different. They may smile at one another and celebrate holidays together, but the difference in their economic interests is ineradicable.

The interests of the proprietor with us are undefined, blurred, so to speak, because there is no one to express them. It is because of this that there is such a difference with us in the behavior of those same directors. One boots open the ministry door and behaves as the private owner of his enterprise, but another sees himself as a temporary manager, and with limited rights even then. There was the same confusion attending the director elections. Where the work-force council was able to arrogate to itself the functions of proprietor, things were successful. In the vast majority of cases, however, there is no longer any point to it, not surprisingly. How can a nonproprietor elect a director? How can a nonproprietor determine management strategy? Reality, not the ill will of the apparatus, compels renunciation of the election of the director by the work-force council. A solution has been found, in my opinion, in the draft Socialist Enterprise Act, which is being discussed by a working group of the Soviet of the Union Commission for the Development of Industry, Energy, Engineering, and Technology and the USSR Supreme Soviet Committee for Economic Reform. It specifies clearly that the interests of the proprietor are represented by a managerial council. Also comprehensible are the board of directors' relations with the managerial council.

In order that the opinion of the working class always be taken into consideration the work force obtains one-third of the votes of the managerial council.

It may be said that a new bureaucratic structure, to which officials of the sectoral ministries will readily desert, is thus being created. After all, the headquarters of the managerial council of a large state enterprise would at least be in Moscow. This would not be the case. The creation of such a structure would make it possible to accomplish what is most important—managing the economy as a single whole. After all, the danger of today's situation, comrades, is that we are dismembering the economy. To fine-sounding slogans, we are driving it into an impasse of narrow group interests. There is today a single economic mechanism of management of the connections of the national economic complex as a single whole—it is the share-capital mechanism. Stock is issued by the state in the amount of the nominal capital of the enterprise or part thereof, and the managerial council becomes a joint-stock council. What is more, selling off the stock into private hands is absolutely unnecessary. The picture could provisionally be as follows: The "Krasnaya Zarya" factory owns 10% of the stock of the "Bolshevik" plant, this latter, in turn, owns 10% of the stock of this factory and 15?

of the stock of a small, but high-technology, Dutch firm.

Understandably, the developed share-capital form will lead to the creation of a financial market, but initially the role of the center will be enormous, and its significance will even grow—not to mention the fact that the state will reserve for itself the controlling block of shares of the defense and other union enterprises of significance for the economy and will obtain additional income from them in the form of dividends.

The share-capital form of ownership will facilitate appreciably the surmounting of a third obstacle, against which we are stumbling currently at every step. It is a question of delineating functions between the union and the republics. Currently, however, we share them out, like at a bazaar, per the following heads: For you, group "B," for us, group "A". But why, in fact? Why is an unprofitable foundry in the Central Urals more important to the union's economy than the Ivanovo weaving factories? Where do information science and electronics fit? After all, many economists believe these to be the base sectors today. The union does not have its own, purely union, territory. And it should be recognized that after the spring elections no union republic, Russia included, will permit the monopoly union departments to lord it as they please on its land, as before.

Some temporary arrangement could be achieved, but it is necessary to prepare long-term instruments for the solution of such conflicts. Stock is an ideal medium: 40% of the stock of the "Bolshevik" plant for the union, 30% for the republic, and, what is more, all would be winners. The amount of invested capital, on the other hand, would be determined by the possibilities of the budget. We would thus be engaging fully two main instruments of indirect state regulation in the hands of the union government: monetary-credit and fiscal policy.

Finally, the last point: What I have said and the entire work which will be performed, specifically, by the USSR Supreme Soviet Committee for Economic Reform on the proposed bills may be likened to the cementing of the walls of canals along which vivifying water for the desert will pass. Only when the work has been done can the sluice gates be opened: new prices and the market principle of their formation introduced. However, this must happen not in 3-5 years—we simply do not have them and no one will give us them—but considerably sooner. I support Comrade Vologzhin, chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet Committee for Economic Reform: We need to ensure that all the proposed bills, including the whole economic reform package, be enacted in 1990. [passage omitted] **A.S. Kapto**, head of the CPSU Central Committee Ideology Department (from the All-Union "Znaniye" Society):

Dear comrade people's deputies! Were I asked if I believed that, a new model of economic relationships having been completed and, finally, the necessary laws having been created, we would be making progress in economic reform, I would not venture an answer in the affirmative. You will agree, I believe, that many innovations in the economy are being held back not only by the opposition of the command-administrative system or the legal lack of protection of the immediate producer.

A serious impediment today (Comrade Samsonov has already spoken about this, but I will dwell on it in more detail) is the incompetence of many specialists and the inadequate scientific study of planned actions. We must finally understand that there is a tremendous gap between economic reform and its stages and personnel policy in this sphere. After all, the new management mechanism will be introduced not by resolutions and not laws in themselves, although they must be worked out perfectly, but by specific people. Their professional level, economic thinking, and legal self-awareness will ultimately determine whether this mechanism works.

However, we must recognize that the defects of the old economic policy and the extensive type of reproduction contained therein continue to operate in the vocational education system. The quality of the training of specialists and worker personnel is forgotten in the race for the notorious "gross." The very structure of the special disciplines in the higher and secondary school has been deformed. It does not correspond even to our requirements, forward plans even less. The mass purposeless training of engineering-technical personnel in obsolete technology and the nonzealous use thereof continues to this time with the former insistence. At the same time, however, the demand for specialists in the priority areas of the development of our economy and in the field of S&T progress is growing everywhere.

The sphere of economic and legal activity has not been provided with the appropriate personnel. We train a large number of economists, for example, but these are mainly specialists in the sphere of concrete economics and political economy. Today, however, we are experiencing a most acute shortage, and this is confirmed by enterprise directors and other business executives. A shortage of qualified personnel in finances, credit, currency transactions, and modern methods of management, and, finally, in the legal regulation of economic activity, about which Comrade Sobchak spoke.

Nor is the current organization of vocational-technical education passing the test of economic reform. Primitively understood cost accounting has prompted the ministries and departments to the allegedly less expensive course training of workers directly on the job. We know that in the developed countries it takes 4 and sometimes 6 years to train a skilled worker. There are no such lengths of time with us. In addition, and this is very disturbing, there has been a rapid decline recently in the intake of trainees in the vocational-technical schools. Educational premises and hostels are being switched to other purposes. The construction of new schools has practically been halted. The qualified engineering-teaching personnel are being flushed out of them. By such a short-sighted policy, many enterprises and sectors even are depriving themselves of a future and consolidating their intrinsic engineering backwardness.

Unfortunately, the traditional approach, which was formed in the stagnation period, may be traced in the forward studies of the future 5-year plan, both in terms of its stages and in principle, and in the conceptual plan of the development of education as a whole. If we are to think about the future in earnest, the development of education should be incorporated in the program of the 13th 5-Year Plan as a strategic priority of perestroyka and an indispensable condition of the recovery of our entire economy. It is extraordinarily important that the restructuring of the entire activity of the secondary and higher vocational school and the training of scientific personnel subsequently develop not autonomously but closely linked with the main stages of radical economic reform.

Growing budget appropriations should be the economic basis of a strengthening of public education. They should be planned in accordance with long-term stable norms. It would seem necessary in this connection to provide in the 13th 5-Year Plan for the elaboration and commissioning of quotas for the development of public education at the state, republic, and, also, the local level.

Together with this, the economic mechanism which is being introduced should contribute to the establishment of the mutually profitable economic relations of the vocational school and the sectors and state and local organs of administration. An effective means in this field could be the formation of a state commission for the training and retraining of personnel for the most important state and also interrepublic regional problems. It is essential here to stimulate interest in its fulfillment by preferential terms of financing and resource provision. We need the appropriate legal safeguards and also economic incentives for the extensive development of educational institutions' contractual relations with enterprises, organizations, and local authorities for the training of personnel, given the partial reimbursement of expenditure from the resources of the work force and local budgets, although I could, of course, have opponents on this issue.

It has to be recognized that due attention has not been paid to these problems in the USSR Supreme Soviet's legislative activity. This should be taken into consideration at the time of preparation of the new principles of legislation on public education, and the necessary adjustments should also be made to the final version of the bills on local self-management, the socialist enterprise, uniform taxation, and certain others.

Two words about basic science. It seems to me that it has been "offended" in our country both at the Congress of People's Deputies and in practice also. After all, the practical tasks connected with the technological revolution can only be accomplished on a solid theoretical basis. We must, in this connection, learn from foreign and, yes, domestic experience. Whereas in the fifties the priority of our domestic science among the important directions was recognized, now, many scientists and specialists and the press estimate that the status of domestic science corresponds to the world level of the last decade. We have approached the point where the lagging of our science could assume a serious nature.

It has to be affirmed that the provision of Soviet researchers with instruments is lower by a factor of four to five and sometimes more compared with the Americans. The communication and information possibilities of our scientists have fallen below the critical levels. To what such an attitude toward science has led can be seen from the state information science, medicine, and ecology—which are of virtually the highest social significance in our society—are in. There is a real danger that, given the transition of the country's economy to market relations, there would be a deterioration of the situation concerning the financing of basic research. The introduction in basic science of cost accounting relations could end badly for it.

We need to be circumspect and to view the long term for we could stand to lose a great deal. This latter viewpoint has recently been gaining quite extensive currency in the press and among the public at large. It is necessary to support the USSR Academy of Sciences to the utmost in its endeavor to effect decisive transformations in the sphere of research activity.

Upon introduction of the new management mechanism, it will be necessary to finally solve the problem of cooperation between industry and the research establishments and educational institutions, providing for the optimum investment of joint scientific research. According to the experience of the United States and a number of other countries of West Europe, a powerful factor of stimulation of scientific research is a preferential tax arrangement and a well conceived policy in respect to so-called "risk research".

It would seem that the commission for completing the draft document which has been distributed to us should take account of a number of points connected with the development of basic science.

We should be paying the most serious attention to the disquieting situation which has taken shape with us concerning educating society. We will be unable to take an appreciable further step forward unless we involve ourselves in this work in earnest, given appreciable financial support and the support of the people's deputies. The possibilities here are immense, both for the state and for parliament. The public organizations, including the "Znaniye" Society and our entire Soviet intelligentsia, which, as we have seen for ourselves repeatedly, is prepared to do everything to accomplish the economic transformations in question at the Congress of USSR People's Deputies, have tremendous possibilities also. **M.P. Mirgazyamov**, chairman of the Bashkir ASSR [Autonomous Soviet Socialist Republic] Council of Ministers (Birskiy National-Territorial Electoral Okrug, Bashkir ASSR):

Dear comrades! I would like to say the following on the question under panel discussion.

First, the report presented by the government is, in my view, a pretty good reference point of society's economic and social development for the upcoming 5-year period. We share the viewpoint that the active components of state regulation of the economy should in the transitional period be preserved together with the elaboration and introduction of new methods of management, a change in attitudes toward ownership and an expansion of market relations.

Second, at the same time, there are in the concept which has been presented many interpretations and propositions which are not indisputable and tasks not fully in keeping with life's realities. Declarations merely for effect predominate in places. The lengthy wheel-spinning of the economic reform at its initial stage and the lack of tangible results are implanting doubts as to the practicability of the time frame of solution of the people's urgent needs. The pressure of the First Congress of USSR People's Deputies and accumulating public opinion probably influenced the change in the originally quoted time frame of emergence from the crisis situation. This fact prompts the thought that a volitional approach in the evaluation of the efficiency of the scheduled economic recovery measures was permitted at the time the concept was being elaborated.

Third, one has the impression that the economic and social efficiency of individual factors of the revitalization and development of the economy have not been properly weighed. For example, it should be borne in mind that obtaining high returns from the first steps is not to be looked for in the process of transition to diverse forms of ownership. Time for adaptation and the assimilation and organization of production on a fundamentally new basis will be needed. We have, on the whole, to agree with the proposition that the diversity of forms of public ownership is not a transitional but normal state of the socialist economy. However, the "diversity of ownership" concept does not amount merely to forms of ownership but encompasses their multiple-type nature also: state, individual, and so forth, and also the various levels thereof: union, republic, administrative-territorial, and so forth.

What is most important, we should also see the multistructural nature of the economy, which is just as real for socialism as a diversity of forms of ownership. This needs to be discussed plainly. We cannot fail to see that there are behind these structures particular social groups with their specific, economic interests. It is perfectly understandable that contradictions between them, of an antagonistic nature at times, are inevitable. Given certain conditions, political organizations with their own claims to political power and with their own political course could emerge on the basis of these social forces. Of course, we need to foresee all this, forecast the possible consequences, and display the greatest caution.

Fourth, in the report, the market is viewed in combination with state regulation as the principal instrument of coordination of the activity of the participants in social production. This proposition would seem inaccurate. The market is itself the regulator of the economy. The state should perform the coordinating role here. The proposition that the market provides for a limitation of monopoly cannot be deemed correct. History has shown that, on the contrary, the market may contribute and does contribute to the development of monopolization. Only the state can curb this process. In this connection, it is essential that we elaborate as quickly as possible a system of antimonopoly measures aimed at overcoming the diktat of the producer in relation to the consumer and the creation of economic conditions conducive to the formation of a competitive network of small- and medium-sized enterprises oriented directly toward market conditions. We shall have to have a transformation here of the system of fines, forfeits, and so forth to ensure full restitution of loss, including missed profit.

Fifth, as far as the alternative versions of the strategy of the country's economic and social development in the next 5-year plan are concerned, we, like the government, prefer the third version. A number of corrections are needed here, in our view. First, it is necessary to find resources for the replacement of the operating fixed capital in industry, where an emergency situation is growing, or for that connected with the implementation of urgent environmental protection measures. Although the proposed version is at first sight of a clearly expressed social focus, the adduced proportions of industrial production with regard to the large differences in percentage value in groups "A" and "B" conceal the actual extent of the reorientation. It would be more correct to evaluate the difference between 27%, 30%, and 33% as a trend than as a decisive reversal of social policy. It is necessary to examine the question here by employing absolute physical amounts. It should be noted that the proposed 2% to 3% reductions in the proportion of the national income consumption fund and the resources for construction for production purposes in the latter half of the 13th 5-Year Plan must not lead to a reduction in the physical amount of the vital-support fund. Only on these conditions is the said reduction permissible.

Sixth, we can agree in principle with the stages of radical economic reform determined in the concept. They are quite well-founded. However circumstances spur us forward, implementation of the reform will take the entire 13th 5-Year Plan. At the same time, the complexity of the tasks which have been advanced and the tremendous time lag of the negative processes which are occurring bring about the danger of prolonging the time frame. We simply cannot agree to this. A slowing of the pace of reform could lead to a new deformation in the economy and a final loss of faith in perestroyka or a return to the old administrative methods of management and explosive phenomena in society.

In this connection, I would deem it expedient primarily in 1990, defined as a preparatory period, to have unfailingly completed all law-making and quota-setting activity, bearing in mind that all the instruments are interrelated and that their normal functioning is possible only in a package. Proceeding from this, the introduction of the legislative instruments cannot be dragged out until 1991-1992, it being essential to have provided for their commissioning in 1991. Only individual instruments of particular complexity, pertaining to the market system, for example, may be postponed until the first half of 1992.

In addition, reform of the organizational structure of management of the economy should not be put off until 1995—the end of the second stage. It should be conducted synchronously with the overall economic reform and be completed in 1993, following the introduction of the new management mechanism. It should be borne in mind that a bags-packed mood, which is holding back a positive solution of the current problems and impoverishing the intellectual potential of capable, qualified specialists as a whole, has reigned for more than 3 years now in the ministries and departments.

Seventh, supplementing and developing individual propositions connected with radical economic reform. I shall make certain specific proposals. Considering that the ministries and departments will not bear the responsibility for a lowering of the profits plan and payments into the budget compared with the control figures which they convey to the enterprises under their jurisdiction and on the basis of which the revenue part of the local budget is formed, it would seem necessary to compensate the budget of the local soviet for the difference in payments thanks to the corresponding reduction in payments to centralized sources of these ministries and departments. For the purpose of improving the computing of labor resources and enlisting additional labor reserves in social production, it is necessary to accelerate the elaboration and enactment of a law on employment in the USSR providing for a strengthening of socialist labor discipline in the economy and the imposition of economic penalties for its violation.

The final point: We need to stimulate the production of consumer goods locally by way of the determination for the enterprises (regardless of departmental jurisdiction) by the local authorities of a territorial commission of the order of up to 15% of the planned amount of work or services with regard for the profile of the enterprises for catering for local requirements. In connection with the fact that the local soviets will bear full responsibility for providing the population with food, it would be expedient to accord the autonomous republic councils of ministers and the kray(obl)ispolkoms [kray (oblast) soviet executive committees] the right to determine a state commission for the production of individual types of foodstuffs produced chiefly from several sources of raw material. [passage omitted] **G.S. Tarazevich**, chairman of the Soviet of Nationalities Nationality Policy and Interethnic Relations Commission (Molodechnenskiy National-Territorial Electoral Okrug, Belorussian SSR):

Dear comrade deputies! I would like to express a few thoughts about the stages of the transitional period of the economic reform which the government report earmarked as being the first. Naturally, a characteristic feature thereof is a combination of directive methods of the control of socioeconomic processes and market relations. I believe that an important part here will also be played by changes in the very essence of the directive methods. To be more precise, the right to a directive is to move downward. This is not new. As is known, the economic reform also began precisely from the lowest component—the State Enterprise Act—which has not been entirely successful, it is true. Its new version is, as is known, on the Supreme Soviet agenda. The law on the general principles of local self-management and the local economy has been adopted in its first reading also.

The levers of management are being transferred downward, seemingly. When one reads carefully into the government concept pertaining to the recovery of the economy, however, one discovers mainly the section that is seen from the center. In my view, this is a serious shortcoming in the Council of Ministers' proposals.

Let us take consumer goods production, a most serious question. The government's proposed measures for its solution in the next 3 years are: Relocation of investments in this sphere, reprofiling of enterprises—the defense sectors included, an energetic increase in the production of equipment for light and food industry, and an increase in the production of intricate home appliances. Well, truly, these are very correct and necessary measures, which may, of course, be implemented only per the directives of the union government. These measures will take time and great effort. This was discussed at the congress yesterday. Big returns are hardly to be expected from these measures in 3 years, in the first year even less. Yet it is in the first year that production of the commodities has to increase 18%. It should be emphasized that it is a question not of criticism of the said proposals, I support them, in general. It is simply that doubts as to the time frame of their realization arise.

What may be proposed additionally? I believe that we are not making full use of our most general and, I would hope, most important reserve—enlistment in the system of actual control of the production of consumer goods of the autonomous formations and local soviets of people's deputies. Thus, for example, their rayon component is today practically disengaged from this problem. I am not talking about agricultural production here. At best the rayispolkom [rayon soviet executive committee] agrees to a plan of the production of commodities for enterprises of a higher jurisdiction. The rayon has practically no such enterprises directly under its own jurisdiction, however.

This was not always the case. For example, there were in the difficult postwar times within rayon jurisdiction within the framework of the producer cooperative system workshops, crafts activities, and small factories and plants. These catered, to a large extent at that time, to the requirements of the local market. The producer cooperative system was liquidated, as you know. The Ministry of Local Industry took possession of this sphere. For a long time, departmental interests buried both local initiative and local possibilities. Clearly, to incorporate the autonomous republics and the local soviets, particularly their lower components, in the management of the production of commodities, we need to put all works of local significance under their jurisdiction. Such decisions have been adopted repeatedly even at the union level, incidentally.

We need also to accord the soviets the corresponding legal and financial possibilities and to develop the local sphere of satisfaction of man's requirements. Depending on a region's possibilities and its raw material resources, it would evidently be expedient entrusting responsibility to the corresponding soviet for providing the population with a particular list of commodities and services without the assistance of the upper echelons of administration. I am speaking about total responsibility. Either make them yourself or purchase them or buy them on exchange terms from other regions. Then the people also will know whose fault it is that there are no goods on the shelves.

I am sure that there is an urgent (acutely urgent) need for each rayon, I emphasize rayon, to have on a financially autonomous basis some economic structures which unite all works of local significance producing consumer goods and which render them assistance in the study of demand, material-technical supply, and the marketing of the products. Such structures could be formed on the basis of the enterprises of local industry and the consumer cooperative system operating currently. They could also unite on a voluntary basis cooperatives, kolkhoz [collective farm] or sovkhoz [state farm] works, and individuals. Of course, the main purpose of such structures would be satisfaction of the requirements of the home market. They could plan their work without any outside interference and on a contractual basis. The role of the soviet on whose territory such an organization operated would be to render assistance and regulate the production of this commodity or the other via a tax system.

A few words about construction. Our main troubles here lie once again in the centralization of management—the trust in the oblast, the ministry in the republic, and ceilings in Moscow. I shall not touch on construction for production. As far, however, as social construction is concerned, all historical experience confirms that such construction has been the concern of either the individual himself and his family or a group of people united by common interests. The state, on the other hand, has performed a negligible role. With us, however, the individual has essentially been detached even from the construction of his own accommodation.

We need, I believe, to establish the firm rule that all social facilities in a rural soviet, rayon, city, and oblast should be built by the region itself under its own steam by its construction subdivisions, be they permanent or temporary and state-owned, leased, or cooperative. The local authorities are obliged to take pains to ensure that the possibilities of these organizations and their capacity correspond to the region's requirements.

Provision with construction materials is a most important question. Decentralization is essential here also. The main thing is to provide the construction site with local resources. Bricks, other wall materials, roofing tiles, ceramic tiles, wood particle board, lime—all these may be produced perfectly well in any oblast and in the majority of rural rayons. The local authorities should be firmly aware that this is their concern. We are today, however, confronted with the fact of bricks having become a most scarce commodity. The small brick plants built since the war—I refer in this instance to Belorussia—are practically completely exhausted, while the major plants—the brainchild of departmental interests—not only are failing to satisfy the increased requirements but entail tremendous transportation costs. I believe that the development of brick production, primarily at small plants throughout the country, should today be a priority task with us and should come ahead of housing and all else.

There are construction materials whose even production in each region is impossible to organize. What, say, about cement, metal, bitumen? Currently, as you know, all such materials are distributed by the center, distributed in accordance with ceilings and amounts of construction and installation work. The mechanism is quite simple. Millions of rubles are embedded or totaled up, say, in the plans, and cement is allocated in accordance with these millions. Here, it seems to me, is the root of the cost-no-object mechanism in construction.

The following might be proposed as an alternative. Allocating from the center not construction ceilings but the cement and other construction materials directly. Then both the client and the planner, knowing how much of what materials they would obtain, would, proceeding from this, create the appropriate projects, and create them, of course, while economizing on resources. So the center's role in social construction should be the least possible. It would only allocate to the regions the scarcest, basic construction materials and, possibly, some amounts of capital investments. All the rest—what to build, when, how, and for whom—should be the business of the rayons, cities, oblasts, and the work force.

Of course, not only the production of consumer goods and social construction should move the local authorities to the forefront. Their role should be considerably larger in the struggle for economies, in energy resources particularly, in the disposal of land, and in the solution of ecological problems. The local soviets could do much, and do it quickly. For this, they must be sovereign masters of their territory and need to be endowed with real rights pertaining to socioeconomic processes and the formation of budgets. It is we legislators who need to do this as quickly as possible.

On 13th 5-Year Plan

90US0306A Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 16 Dec 89 Morning Edition pp 11-15

[Report on speeches at 14 December morning session of the Second Congress of USSR People's Deputies, on the "Fundamental Approaches to Elaboration of the 13th 5-Year Plan"]

[Excerpts] [Passage omitted] **V.A. Masol**, chairman of the Ukrainian SSR [Soviet Socialist Republic] Council of Ministers (Donetskiy-Leninskiy Territorial-Electoral Okrug, Donetskaya Oblast):

Dear comrade people's deputies! Considering that I took part in discussion of this report, in which we expressed many observations, and that some of them were taken into consideration, I would like today to dwell merely on certain issues.

First, you will all agree, I believe, that the measures scheduled for the 13th 5-Year Plan to enhance the people's living standard and the whole social program are practical only given an increase in the scale and rate of growth of social production, primarily its material sphere. In this connection the reduction in capital investments for the development of the base sectors should, although being a forced measure, have, in our opinion, prudent limits and be of a temporary nature. Today, these are the sectors most backward in terms of equipment provisions. For this reason it seems to me that the prospects for the development of the base sectors in the coming 5-year plan have to be viewed in particular. We have noticed that the proposed measures contain not a single figure pertaining to the base sectors. Yet we need to consider that they will immediately and directly influence the accomplishment of social tasks. I cannot believe in the practicality of the task recorded in the proposition to the effect that as of 1990 work will start on the supply of gas to the villages and the countryside and the construction of water mains. How are we to do this? After all, there will be no additional pipes, given the sharp cutback in the development of ferrous metallurgy.

Second, our most urgent problem is the food problem. It seems to me that a decisive plan is needed for an upturn of the economy of the agro-industrial complex, particularly its unprofitable and low-profitability farms, for the strengthening of these farms primarily through the development of construction and an increase in supplies to them of modern equipment, material resources, fuel, and fertilizer, combined with the development of leasing and the formation of agricultural cooperatives. Unfortunately, as already noted by the previous speaker, the propositions of the report concerning the accelerated replacement of the material-technical base of the agro-industrial complex, the reequipment of the processing industry, and the priority development of the social sphere in the countryside are not backed up by the allocation of resources and equipment, particularly in road-building, not only for the long term, I would say, but even for 1990. We talk about operating without roads, but resources for building them have even been removed for 1990. It seems to me that we should be striving to ensure that the document which we are discussing includes practical measures. There should be no place in it for empty slogans and hare-brained schemes.

Third, problems which have arisen with the development of wholesale trade. Its introduction under the conditions of a shortage of resources and the monopoly position of many enterprises has created conditions for wide-scale exchange transactions, not only involving surplus products from state orders but also thanks to extra-plan and contract supplies. This is the main reason today for the misalignment of material-technical supplies, and it has caused disconnection between industries. Of course, we understand that this does not come about from an abundance of resources, it comes from a shortage. Is there a solution? Yes. I believe that we should consciously and clearly say that we should establish for strategic resources (fuel, cement and such) a 100% state order. And then these items would be removed from the agenda. If you wish to sell a spare product, do not reduce the manufacture of a strategic raw material but rather increase it.

The report and the draft measures provide for 90% of the state order. This means a reduction in production. Thus the diminution in the allocation of resources for agriculture will, as in this 5-year plan, continue. I confirm what Comrade Ligachev said in his speech, that the resources for agriculture in this 5-year plan will decline 15%-20% compared with 1985.

Fourth, we support economic measures pertaining to an increase in supplies of agricultural products to union stocks. The responsibility of the republics is provided for here. But I would like to say, comrades, that responsibility should be mutual. Since we are responsible for supplies to union stocks, the center should provide for the allocation to us of the necessary resources for this purpose. Currently we have responsibility, but the center does not. A new agro-industrial commission has been formed, and it makes this proposal: Reduce supplies to the republic of formula food for 1990, but leave supplies to the union stocks at the same level. I would like to say today to the center and everyone else that if the supplies of formula food provided for in the plan are reduced, we will not produce the supplies of meat and milk for the union stocks. Reciprocity must be mutual.

And one further matter. The report notes a particular feature for the realization of the housing program in the 13th 5-Year Plan. It is proposed to gradually increase the amount of apartment housing construction, thanks to individual and cooperative housing construction. This is a correct trend, I believe. But, given this formulation of the question, it is essential that we stipulate more precisely safeguards for the socially unprotected groups of the population. Pensioners, doctors, and teachers, who obtain accommodation along local soviet lines, should be attributed to such groups. The situation here is exceptionally serious and might not improve since extremely limited resources are being allocated to this end.

In our republic the situation is also complicated by the need for the additional removal of residents from the contamination zone around the Chernobyl AES [Nuclear Electric Power Station], the government's commitments pertaining to the granting of accommodation to the miners, the release into the reserve of a large number of officers, the resettlement of the Crimean Tatars, and so forth.

In order to alleviate the situation concerning the acquisition of accommodation along local soviet lines, urgent and effective measures are needed. According to our calculations, in the 13th and 14th 5-Year Plans the amount of state centralized capital investments allocated for this purpose must at least double. We believe that this government approach should be reflected in the report.

On the whole, however, we share the main fundamental approaches to the formation of the plan of the coming 5-year period and propose their approval. However, it needs to be said plainly that the difficult conditions of the years to come, the entry into force of a large number of new laws, and the transition of all the union republics to the principles of financial autonomy and self-financing will create certain difficulties for the forecasting of the situation even for the next two-three years.

All the pluses and minuses and the economic consequences of these and other measures are still insufficiently clear. But even today there is reason to concern ourselves with preventing the republics' isolation, which would be unwarranted and dangerous for us. Rather, we must all learn to skillfully combine the benefits of economic sovereignty and self-management of the territories with the principles of socialist federalism and the interests of the other national formations and our whole country. Only political and economic integration, the consolidation of all constructive democratic forces, high labor discipline and law and order, and the conscientious, highly productive labor of each will permit us to successfully traverse the thorny path of economic transformations and ensure the practicality of the aims and tasks of perestroyka. Thank you for your attention. [passage omitted]

R.A. Bazarova, chairman of the Turkmen SSR Supreme Soviet Presidium and deputy chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet (Kunya-Urgenchskiy National-Territorial Electoral Okrug, Turkmen SSR]:

Dear comrade deputies! Continuing the debate which developed yesterday at the plenary session, I would like to say first of all that when evaluating the USSR Council of Ministers report we should certainly not reduce to a minimum all the measures which are envisaged for economic recovery. I believe that the USSR Council of Ministers report maps out major measures for extricating the country from its difficult situation. But certain provisions of the draft program require amplification and additional work with regard to regional features is another matter. One of the main problems, on whose solution the growth of the living standard and well-being of the people of the entire Central Asia region, Turkmenia included, depends, is, comrades, solution of the problem of the population's employment. However, the program of economic recovery, the 13th 5-Year Plan included, does not provide for centralized measures for a solution of this problem. One out of every five able-bodied people in the republic is not employed in the sphere of social production. The population's low employment level has led to serious social consequences. Practically one out of every three inhabitants of the republic has a total income of R75 a month or less.

The problem is further complicated by the fact that the intensification of production and the introduction of new management methods are inevitably resulting in a reduction in the numbers of those at work. Thus the interests of the sector demand a reduction in jobs, but the interests of the region demand the creation of new ones.

In addition, investment policy is now being revised in the direction of an appreciable reduction in capital investments for production construction. The reduction in the front of construction at production facilities and also the establishment of a tax on new construction will entail a reduction in the numbers of construction workers and bring a halt to the creation of new jobs.

Not participating in social production, considerable numbers of the population of Turkmenia and all of Central Asia are deprived of the most important social safeguard, virtually—realization of their right to work. We therefore believe that the country should have a uniform state employment policy. Its implementation should be entrusted to the USSR Gosplan [State Planning Committee] and the USSR State Committee for Labor and Social Problems for this task cannot be tackled by the efforts of the republics alone.

We have raised repeatedly the question of the fact that it is necessary together with the construction of large-scale enterprises in the raw material areas to develop small works of the labor-intensive sectors—affiliates of the union enterprises.

Particular significance is attached here to the creation of a highly developed cotton industry, inasmuch as cotton is the republic's leading agricultural crop. The solution of this question is not only of economic but also political significance. Cotton industry enterprises created in conjunction with the Russian Federation and other union republics would work to further strengthen the international friendship of the peoples.

I would like to emphasize particularly that additional guarantees of employment should be determined for such socially unprotected groups of the population as general school graduates and also women with children. The local soviets must be accorded the right to determine reserved quotas for these categories of the population and to impose financial penalties on those who fail to carry out the rulings of the local authorities.

We believe that the proposed measures would make it possible in a short period of time to appreciably lower the level of social tension associated with the population's unemployment.

I shall focus attention on one further problem. We support the speeches of a number of deputies who have said that the system of state orders has not as yet been perfected, as a whole.

The Turkmen republic, for example, has received for the principal types of export products a 100% state order, which incorporates the products of petroleum refining and cotton fiber. Although not regulated by a state order, natural gas is also, by virtue of the specifics of its shipment, practically a 100% state order.

At the same time the products which are supplied to the republic are covered by a state order far less than 100%. This puts us in an unequal position. In our opinion, it is necessary to determine the level of the state order for all types of products. Some people have suggested that it be established at the 70%-80% level, but 90% would be the most rational, I believe. We could form a commodity market and balance material-technical supply with the remaining 10%.

In the system of the proposed measures pertaining to the country's socioeconomic recovery, a particular place is assigned to the development of the agro-industrial complex. We fully support the principles and approaches in the accomplishment of this task set out in Comrade Ryzhkov's report and Comrade Ligachev's speech. In drawing up the plan for the 13th 5-year period the republic is providing for the preferential growth of the food sector: The intensive development of grain farming and the production of vegetables and melon crops.

However, the implementation of these structural changes is closely connected with the water situation in the republic, particularly in areas such as the Aral region and Tashauz Oblast. When we speak about a solution to the problems of the Aral region, we refer, of course, to Karakalpakia. I have to say that Tashauz Oblast and, particularly, its northern rayons—Oktyabrskiy and Kunya-Urgenchskiy (from where I myself was elected USSR people's deputy)—are in fact, in terms of the environment and the population's living standard, absolutely no different from either Karakalpakia or Khorezm. Despite the adoption of the well-known government decree on Aral and our repeated appeals to the USSR Council of Ministers, the USSR Supreme Soviet Committee for Ecology and the Rational Use of Natural Resources, and the USSR State Committee for Labor and Social Problems requesting an examination of questions of a rise in the population's living standard, an improvement in the standard of farming, and a recovery of the ecological situation, insufficient measures are being adopted as yet. It is necessary to once again return to a study of these questions, incorporating in a special paragraph questions of medical services for the population of Tashauz Oblast, and to take this into consideration when the 13th 5-Year Plan is being formulated.

I would like to mention one additional point. Social tension in society is quite high, and for this reason all measures infringing the working people's interests, even temporary, may not always be correctly understood. We share the opinion that monetary reform and a ration card system could lend impetus to the even greater spurring of tension in society. A cautious and balanced approach is needed here.

We support the proposal that we should revise the time frame for implementation of comprehensive reform of the system of wholesale, purchase, and retail prices, beginning it in the latter half of 1990 and completing it fully in 1991. Stretching it out to a later date would not afford an opportunity for the full deployment and implementation of radical economic reform. A reform of pricing would make it possible to determine more quickly a real system of interrepublic, interregional economic relations under the conditions of regional cost accounting.

While approving the program submitted by the government as a whole, we would request that the people's deputies take our proposals into account. [passage omitted]

N.Ya. Petrakov, corresponding member of the USSR Academy of Sciences and deputy director of the USSR Academy of Sciences Central Economico-Mathematical Institute, Moscow (from the USSR Academy of Sciences):

Dear deputies, I would like to dwell on the concept of the 5-year plan. It has to be said that it has essential positive points, to which the speakers have paid insufficient attention. These include the social thrust of the plan, which we should welcome. And, second, the structural changes outlined in this program. But it needs to be said that insufficiently decisive steps, particularly in the sphere of a change in investment policy, are being taken here.

For many years investment policy has been an appreciable inflationary factor of our economic development. The substantial and accelerating emission of ready cash, the rise in prices, the decline in the purchasing power of the ruble—these primarily are the results of incompetent investment policy. Creating a market on the basis of a declining currency and inflationary processes is simply impractical. A disintegration of the market and farms' conversion to in-kind payment are currently under way in our country, individual regions are endeavoring to acquire an independent currency, and so forth. All this is evidence that a market economy is not taking shape here but, on the contrary, disintegrating.

Yuriy Dmitriyevich Maslyukov was absolutely right to express in his opening remarks concern that we are burying a very great deal of money in the ground, as they say, and creating incomplete facilities and incomplete construction. Truly, this is an on-going process. According to an estimate of the State Committee for Statistics, this year we will once again have an increase in incomplete construction of R18 billion. Above-quota incomplete construction accounts for just over R16 billion of this. And what does R18 billion mean from the viewpoint of our money market? It means approximately one-third, that is, R6 billion, are not backed by commodities. This is what the increase in incomplete construction means. And this is why this investment process leads to inflation. But the point is that in the plan for 1990 we have once again determined a very modest reduction in the sum total of financing of capital construction. We are once again stimulating protracted construction and multiplying it by multiple construction. Whereas budget financing has diminished quite substantially, the overall amount of planned capital investments has declined by about 3%. This is entirely insufficient. Decisive measures are needed here.

I would consider it necessary—this is my first proposal—to instruct the government to draw up a program for freezing construction projects and also a program of other anti-inflation measures, and to submit it for examination by the USSR Supreme Soviet in the next few months. I believe that it is the government and the central planning authorities that could perform such work because no one other than the central departments can view all the production components of a freeze of facilities under construction. The amounts of capital investment need to be brought into line with the possibilities of the construction organizations, and their physical plant modernized appreciably. Protracted construction now reigns with us because construction organization capacity accounts for only 64%-70% of the entire construction front.

Further, I would consider it necessary to also draw up a program of change in the direction of S&T progress. The concept speaks absolutely correctly about the fact that it is necessary to take resource-saving as the reference point. But the point is that we must further orient ourselves toward ensuring that S&T progress stimulate the incorporation of our economy in the system of the international division of labor and that we do away with the exclusiveness and closed nature of our economy. After all, it has reached the point where we look like a raw material appendage of Western countries and even East European countries in terms of the nature of our exports.

We say that we need to increase the proportion of mechanical engineering products. This is correct, but we need a special concept making it possible to find our place in the international division of labor. This problem is not being studied at all currently. The open nature of the economy also incorporates aspects connected with joint ventures and the attraction of Western technology.

We have no need to invent the bicycle. And in this sense I would consider that the government should prepare and submit for examination by the USSR Supreme Soviet a program of the development of foreign economic relations. The concept presented to us contains the section "Improvement of the Country's Currency Situation". But this is not all that is required. The currency situation could also be improved in accordance with the method, for example, of Romania, which has paid off all its debts, but, on the other hand, has an extremely low living standard. This is not, I believe, our way, and it is not simply a question here of currency improvement but real inclusion in the world market.

One further very material question was broached yesterday in Deputy Novozhilov's speech. He opened the curtain a little on problems of conversion. We are generally placing therein big and, it would seem, not entirely correctly oriented hopes as some sort of magic wand. Yet everything is very complex here. The defense sectors currently are in fact frequently replicating old technology. Conversion needs to be completely different. The tremendous S&T potential of the defense complex can and should be used for the mass manufacture of civilian products of a fundamentally new quality.

For example, a process of the development of high-definition television has now begun in the world. Why are we not involving ourselves with this problem? Not replicating the present television receivers but creating new video and television equipment at the level of world models is what is needed.

Also of considerable importance is the problem of the prestige and the privileges of people employed in the military-industrial complex. We must not, I believe, in the course of conversion infringe upon their interests. These people have done much for the country and for strengthening our defense capability. And we now need to be very punctilious toward them and to take care to keep together the teams of highly skilled scientists, engineering-technical personnel, and workers. I believe that these problems also should be reflected in a special conversion program. There is no such program as yet, but one is needed, and it should be discussed by the USSR Supreme Soviet.

The measures outlined in the concept for the coming 5-year plan may be implemented successfully only given transition to a new system of planning, management, and market relations. This is emphasized in the report also. But over and above this it is necessary to emphatically change the economic role of the state. We need to abandon the concept of in-kind centralism and switch to a concept of financial centralism. The central leadership gets most of its headaches precisely from the fact that we have no market relations and that we lack a situation whereby it is possible, having manufactured and sold products and obtained the money, to freely purchase what is required. Bricks, cement, pipes—to purchase all these it is necessary to apply to Moscow. We will not get far this way. It is essentially a question of the Ministry of Finance and the Gosbank [State Bank] playing the leading roles here. It was noted at the first congress, incidentally, that the Gosbank should, in the opinion of many specialists, be withdrawn from the government and become an independent credit institution. Currently, however, the Gosbank performs the role of automatic creditor. I therefore believe that the main problem of the restructuring of management is that of financial centralism.

And, finally, the state should protect primarily the consumer, and not the producer, as has always been the case. The existence of sectoral ministries raises queries in this respect. They are essentially defenders of the rights of the producers. We will always have the monopolism of the producer as long as there are sectoral ministries. And, correspondingly, there will be no real market necessarily presupposing that the consumer and the producer are in an equal position. Unfortunately, while meticulously discussing the candidacies of each minister the members of the Supreme Soviet forgot to thoroughly discuss the list of ministries itself and the structure of the Council of Ministers offered for examination. It went through almost automatically. It seems to me that this was a mistake by our Supreme Soviet because it is high time we abandoned sectoral monopolism, the exponents of which are the sectoral ministries. Thank you for your attention.

More on Stages of Economic Reform

90US0309A Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 17 Dec 89 Morning Edition pp 6-10

[Report on speeches at Second Congress of USSR People's Deputies at 14 December session on "Stages of Economic Reform"]

[Excerpts] [Passage omitted] **E.Yu. Salayev**, president of the Azerbaijan SSR [Soviet Socialist Republic] Academy of Sciences (Shekinskiy National- Territorial Electoral Okrug, Azerbaijan SSR):

Dear chairman! Dear deputies! General propositions of economic recovery are elaborated at quite a high level in the report that has been submitted. Certain aspects of the report may undoubtedly be commended as a new step forward in the theory of perestroyka. At the same time, mention has to be made of the limited nature of certain parts of the report, the reason for which, most likely, is the current level of development of the economic theory of perestroyka.

The absence of a clear-cut theoretical and methodological approach to the recovery of the country's economy is impeding the solution of many urgent problems on a high scientific level. The measures proposed by the government have been drawn up mainly for the existing economic model of society. It is proposed preserving the state monopoly in the key sectors of the national economic complex, thereby depriving the producer-goods market of an essential element of development—competition, consumer influence, and so forth. There is also another factor which is lowering the efficiency of the planned measures. This is the shadow economy, which in terms of scale long since slipped out of control. Therefore, until the law on property in the USSR and an economic model of society in keeping with this law are adopted, the program of economic recovery which has been submitted will hardly be of any value.

A second major shortcoming of the report is connected with the question of the correlation of political, economic, social, and other aspects in the problems broached. The clear predominance of the first over the remaining aspects in the report testifies that we have yet to completely rid ourselves of the old political thinking. This becomes obvious when the reasons for the deceleration of our development up to 1985 and since are ascertained. This also is impeding the solution of a number of complex problems, including delimitation of the rights of the USSR, the union republics, and the autonomous formations. Given this multivariant system, it is proposed transferring to the center the inalienable property of the peoples of the USSR—the key sectors of the economy of the union republics. This is why the proposed concept of ownership, like other artificial things and phenomena, has not justified and continues to not justify itself politically, economically, or legally.

On the one hand, the statements of the classics of Marxism to the effect that property disunites, but labor unites are forgotten. On the other, account is not taken of the sociopsychological and moral components bound by property relations. It is also forgotten that the union republic is the foundation, but that the union is derived. Consideration of these important points could clearly and unequivocally answer the question of to whom the land, its interior, and the cultural and historical values of the USSR peoples belong.

According to the report, we should develop the process of expansion of the rights of the union republics by proceeding from the "strong center means a strong republic" principle and its modified forms. In my opinion, this principle and all its modified forms fail to correspond to the ideals of sovereignty and are nonviable. It would seem to me in this connection that the basis of actual sovereignty should be an entirely different formula: freedom plus equality plus competition based on good intentions.

The concept of the country's economic recovery is as yet far from perfection and cannot serve as the final version of the model of the socioeconomic development of the country and also the union republics for many years to come since many of its propositions are not backed by scientifically substantiated calculations. Let us take, for example, the union republics' budget for 1990, which is highlighted in the report as a particular period and decisive year for emergence from the crisis. In 1990 the per capita expenditure of Azerbaijan's budget will constitute little more than R600. This is less by a factor of almost two than the corresponding indicator of the Baltic republics. It is hard to understand why Azerbaijan, with an annual difference between national income produced and consumed of approximately R1.7 billion--16% of total national income—lives worse than many others. It would be socially just were we to shape the budgets of the republics proceeding from the population's actual requirements.

The long-standing discrimination in the sphere of formation of the budget is a principal factor of the increased social tension in Azerbaijan and the deformation of the structure of the republic's economy over many years. It has played an important part in turning the AzSSR into a cheap raw material base.

The report takes insufficiently into consideration a number of important nuances of the actual complex life of certain union republics. Let us take the problem of unemployment and refugees. In connection with the maladroit regulation of a number of interrelated demographic, social, and economic processes in the AzSSR, tens of thousands of young people remain outside of social production annually. A solution of the urgent problems of Azerbaijan proceeding from the principles expounded in Comrade Ryzhkov's report will hardly remove the social tension and improve interethnic relations in the republic. It will increase the diktat and interference of the ministries and departments in the republic's affairs and impede the solution of ecological and other urgent problems in the republic. ((passage omitted)) **V.K. Chernyak**, head of a department of the Ukrainian SSR Academy of Sciences Economics Institute, Kiev (Kiev City National-Territorial Electoral Okrug, UkSSR):

We should evidently agree with the ultimate model proposed by the government, but greater specificity is required. We need to design a mechanism of transition. Complete clarity on this matter is lacking. Urgent measures should also evidently be supported. Safeguards against bureaucratic rule becoming the norm are indeed necessary. What are the urgent measures for? For prolonging the life of the old system? Or for creating a launch pad and surging ahead? This is the question. We are the captives of an administrative system, captives of the Stalin model. The main problem now is how to obtain our release from this captivity. All that we are doing we are doing within the framework of the system and in accordance with the established model.

I support the suggestion that we urgently need a package of laws which would play the part of delivery vehicle capable of wrenching us away from the pull of the old system. For this reason, I have an ambivalent attitude toward urgent measures. The danger here is that they could become a rule of life.

Now, as regards the 13th 5-Year Plan, this part of the report cannot be supported. It is contrary to perestroyka and is sustained, on the whole, in the spirit of the old approaches. It is hard to understand what, on the other hand, will secure a breakthrough into the future and open the way to initiative in all components of the economy. It is usually said: We live badly because we work badly. I do not agree. We work badly because we live badly. This is the point. Working well is unprofitable to both the individual worker and the outfit. We have created an economy under whose conditions working well is unprofitable. The main problem is how to ensure that working well is profitable. Everyone knows full well that we have created an economy of the absurd. We have to abandon the idea of bureaucratic rule in the economy, the idea of implementation of perestroyka from above. We are borne along by force of inertia in all things: Inertia of thought, inertia of action, inertia of management. The document submitted to the congress also bears the imprint of inertia and of a transitional approach—that same celebrated transitional nature of our condition, when we can adopt nothing permanent. Temporary measures have to be adopted once again.

I understand the current difficulties, but there should not be centralized quotas, nonetheless. We need to secure independence for the republics, enterprises, and soviets. What the government is proposing is a package of measures, but what we need is economic reform. We are as yet discrediting the underlying principle of reform, which we ourselves adopted. I would say that it is a game of figures, of the old approaches. Figures are needed, no question, but are these the most important thing in economics?

Here is an example of the old approach—delegation of functions from the center to the localities. This was heard once again yesterday in the report. It should, however, be the other way around: Where independent republics and enterprises delegate some of their functions to the center. The report contains a centrist model. Today, on the other hand, a broadening of republics' independence, sovereignty, self-management, and self-financing are necessary; free enterprise is necessary. A way out of the crisis, in my opinion, is possible only on the basis of economic and political liberty. Liberty is essential to us today. This—liberty—is a honeyed word. The center should not be endeavoring to lead and control everything, it should be granting liberty. We need to make the USSR a free-enterprise zone, whence the problem of ownership, the problem of the market, and the problem of economic independence. Regional problems are studied inadequately in Comrade Ryzhkov's report and in the government material.

The final question, with which I began and will close: the question of priorities. This is the main question. Why, to what end are we doing all that we have planned? In the name of what is the economy developing? I believe that the quality of life should be made the main criterion of the country's socioeconomic development. Precisely quality of life, people's health and their life expectancy. Currently, however, our country is becoming a zone, and we, a degenerating nation, a degenerating people. This is what is actually happening. For this reason, we should let this criterion in the total diversity of its aspects take precedence. And then give thought to what is required for this: What kind of accommodation, what kind of medicine, what kind of education, what kind of science? [passage omitted]

More on 13th 5-Year Plan

90US0310A Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 17 Dec 89 Morning Edition pp 10-14

[Report on speeches at Second Congress of People's Deputies' 14 December afternoon session "On Principled Approaches to Working Out 13th 5-Year Plan"]

[Excerpts][Passage omitted] **M.I. Mongo**, secretary of the Commission of the Soviet of Nationalities on Nationality Policy and Interethnic Relations (Evenkiyskiy National-Territorial Electoral Okrug, RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic]):

Esteemed people's deputies! Recent public interest in the issues of the minor peoples of the north and their areas of residence has remained great. This heightened interest is understandable. This region comprises more than 60% of the area of the Russian Federation and 50% of our country's territory. Several all-union and regional programs are being carried out in this large territory. Their implementation undoubtedly will be a tremendous influence on the socioeconomic development of these regions.

Problems accumulated in the development of the economy and culture of the minor peoples of the north have now become exceptionally acute and contradictory. As is known, concern about the existing situation has been reflected in the CPSU platform on nationality issues. This was stated with full force at the First Congress of People's Deputies and at the First and Second Sessions of the Supreme Soviet.

At present, it is becoming increasingly apparent that the rapid industrial development of these regions has come to clash sharply with the traditional lifestyle of the local populace, despite authoritative statements in this prestigious forum in years past that we had no problems in the socioeconomic development of the ethnic periphery at the time nor would we have any. Meanwhile, we have had such problems, and we still do.

If we add to this the exceptionally difficult, at times extreme, environments in which the minor peoples of the north live, then we are certainly looking at a web of great contradictions. To a great degree, the situation of the northerners is exacerbated by excessive intrafarm costs, transportation by air, increasing costs of capital construction, and electricity. Annual outlays of the deer-breeding and hunting industry amount to no less than R40 million while the annual gross product amounts to R620 million. In essence, the traditional branches of the economy of the northern peoples have supplied cheap raw materials to the enterprises of various industries which, incidentally, generates sizable profits. As a result of the departmental approach by some union and republic ministries and departments which are developing industry in the north, the fodder resources of deer breeding are reduced, the hunting grounds and resources of the most valuable varieties of fish are endangered.

Thus, economic, social, demographic, and ecological problems have become more acute in the northern region in recent years. This can be easily seen in our Evenkiyskiy Autonomous Okrug. As we see it, the most significant shortcoming is that the preparation of many government documents proceeded without taking the opinion of the northern peoples themselves into account while, indeed, many good resolutions were adopted.

Referring to our problems, we northerners understand well that Russia is not to blame for our misfortunes but rather it is the overall oppression by the administrative-industrial machine which, as the writer Valentin Rasputin said at the First Congress of USSR People's Deputies, has turned out to be worse than the Mongol yoke for Russia and has fleeced Russia so badly that it is barely alive. It is also true that the industrial machine which is destroying our unique northern nature is to a great degree responsible for interethnic complications.

As is known, great concern about the social situation of the minor northern peoples has been expressed in the CPSU platform in conjunction with the most acute problems of the northerners brought up at the First and Second Congresses of USSR People's Deputies. It says there that these peoples need special state protection and aid. We believe that it is urgent:

1. To set up the USSR State Committee for the Affairs of the Minor Peoples of the North, transferring to it all funds from the state budget allocated from the center for the socio-economic development of these peoples. Why a USSR rather than an RSFSR Committee? Because mainly the enterprises of union ministries and departments operate in our area, in the north. Representatives of 42 union-republic ministries work in the north of Krasnoyarsk Kray alone, in Evenkiya and Taymyr. Such a committee existed, but was eliminated without justification.

Justice will be done in this manner, and we will save 26 minor peoples of the north from ethnic destruction.

2. To implement a set of extensive state, republic-level measures aimed at meeting as fully as possible the ethnic and cultural needs of the northern peoples. I mean the development and adoption of a long-range state program for the development of the economy and culture of these peoples until the year 2005 accompanied by centralized funding and resource allocation, taking extensive advantage of the opportunity to use the fund of compensatory moneys for financing the social program. Measures for the development of traditional industries and their advance to a qualitatively new level on the basis of the accomplishments of scientific-technical progress, leasing and cooperative forms of labor organization, and progressive domestic and foreign experience should be envisaged in the 13th 5-Year Plan and in the long-range program. Also, a program for the restoration of small localities with a maximum of amenities directly in the places where traditional industries are located and production-related migrations occur should be envisaged.

3. Taking into account the particular urgency of protecting the natural environment in the areas of residence of the northern peoples, government organs and scientific establishments may be entrusted with developing and submitting to the USSR Supreme Soviet for consideration a draft law on nature utilization in the areas of the Far North, Siberia, and the Far East in cooperation with the local soviets of people's deputies and with broad circles of the public invited to participate. The law would become the foundation for new social technologies for developing natural resources in these large regions of the country.

4. It is also necessary to provide for the augmentation of the material and technical facilities of deer-breeding and hunting establishments and other enterprises of the agroindustrial complex on a new foundation in the areas of residence of the northern peoples.

5. The RSFSR Gosagroprom [State Agroindustrial Committee], the RSFSR Glavokhota [Main Administration for Hunting and Reserves], the RSFSR State Committee for Prices, and the USSR Ministry of Finance need to resolve the issue of correlating the prices for the products of traditional branches of the economy and crafts (I mean meat, fat, hides of wild hoofed and marine animals, water fowl, and so on) with the procurement and wholesale prices for agricultural products.

Furthermore, the organizations reporting to the RSFSR Gosagroprom, the Glavokhota, and the Russian Union of Consumer Cooperatives located in the areas of residence of the peoples of the north should be allowed to sell at contract prices no less than 30% of the planned volume of furs procured, including sable, to the enterprises of consumer cooperatives and state trade through their own commercial outlets, with this being counted toward plan fulfillment. This is vitally important to us northerners. It is also necessary to sell all above-plan products of hunting and the consumer goods produced from them without collecting the turnover tax.

In summation, we ask that resolution of the issue of specifying planned financial statistics for the development of the autonomous okrugs of the RSFSR in a special item in the plans and budgets of relevant krays and oblasts be speeded up in keeping with the CPSU platform and with a view to enhancing the role and legal status of the autonomous okrugs.

I also propose that the structures of the 13th 5-Year Plan significant in principle—the development program for areas of the Far North—be separated out, funded, and be allocated material resources from the center. While approving the program of the government on the whole, we await the resolution of the northern issues. [passages omitted]

Yu.D. Maslyukov:

Esteemed comrade deputies! I have received quite a number of questions. With your permission, I will respond to them. However, I have a request to make if you agree. As I can see, the number of deputies in the auditorium has decreased a lot compared to this morning. Perhaps, I should not respond to the questions of those who are absent? I believe that this would be fair. Are Comrades Iskandarov and Fedorov here? Then let me read the question.

"As of the beginning of 1989, enterprises of the Uzbek SSR [Soviet Socialist Republic] had profit margins of 17% to 19%. Due to the spontaneous increases in prices for materials, spare parts, and raw materials, profit margins at the end of 1989 are at 3% to 4%. Contributions to the budget are envisaged on the basis of 17% to 19% profit margins. The apprehension is that in 1990 the enterprises will become unprofitable. Esteemed Yuriy Dmitriyevich, we ask that you explain this issue."

The data need to be more precise. Over the 9 months of 1988, the profit margin in Uzbekistan amounted to 14%, and during the same period of 1989—19.9%, that is, it increased by 5 points. On the whole, profits in the industry of the republic, including enterprises reporting to the union, amounted to R1.85 billion in the 9 months of last year, and in the 9 months of this year—R2,078 million, that is, it grew by 12%. Price-setting organs do not envisage a price increase in 1990. However, in the course of carrying out the reform of wholesale prices, the Uzbekistan State Committee on Prices projects a profit margin of 23.5%. This is why your apprehensions are unfounded. If there are any questions, they can be worked on with representatives of the USSR State Committee on Prices.

The next question is from Comrade Tyutryumov, chairman of the trade union committee of the Kondopoga Paper Industry [Association] in the Karelian ASSR [Autonomous Soviet Socialist Republic]. This issue has been resolved. The point was that Kondopoga could not dispatch railroad cars and was thus unable to haul the newsprint needed by the newspaper PRAVDA.

Comrade Rubiks from Riga: "I am in favor of the third variant. However, thus far, repairs and maintenance of the housing stock in the cities, health care facilities, schools, development of urban transit, and street repairs have been allocated material resources at the rate of 40% to 60%. This has created municipal facilities which are becoming decrepit and are being neglected, which is causing the justifiable dissatisfaction of citizens. At present, the responsibility of local soviets for resolving these issues will increase many times over in conjunction with a transition to local self-government. Meanwhile, the issues of material-technical supply for the needs of local soviets have not been resolved and are not being resolved. They are not covered by the state order. I would ask for an explanation of how the material-technical needs of local soviets are going to be met."

Comrades, there is a very clear-cut draft law on republic economic accountability. As is known, the Baltic republics have proposed their own variant of this draft law. It provides for the republic to receive material and technical resources only through the mutual relations that exist between the republic and the state as a whole. All other issues are resolved on a contractual basis between the republics.

I believe that making decisions in Moscow on every pipe needed to repair a house or for some other public or housing need will not get us anywhere. As far as keeping up the housing conditions is concerned, much was said about this in the report. This is a multifaceted issue but as far material and technical supply is concerned I have given explanations. **A.I. Demidov**, associate professor at the Plant-Higher Technical School of the Turbine Building Association "Leningrad Metal Works," city of Leningrad (Kalininskiy Territorial Electoral Okrug, city of Leningrad):

Esteemed Yuriy Dmitriyevich, what initiatives is the government going to offer as far as antimonopoly legislation is concerned? This is the first question. The second is: In all developed countries, nuclear power generation is being curtailed. What is the view of our government on the development of this type of power generation in the USSR? The third question: Why are the prices for resources (oil, gas, timber) which the RSFSR supplies to other union republics, including the Baltic republics, lower than world prices? Why are the foreign trade proceeds of the RSFSR being shamelessly taken away by other republics through the "center?"

Yu.D. Maslyukov:

Draft antimonopoly legislation has been developed and submitted. Price and profit margin levels which are controlled provide the foundation for it. If an enterprise is a monopoly according to the criteria set forth, the price level is to be controlled by the state. If the profit margin of this enterprise exceeds a certain threshold, several variants of taxation are envisaged. The draft law is very interesting; the USSR Supreme Soviet is presently working on it. I believe you will be able to familiarize yourself with it.

As far as nuclear power generation is concerned, this is a sore point. Certainly, the Chernobyl tragedy did a great deal of damage. Absolutely correct, Comrade Yanshin, I agree with you. However, the main point is that stable resistance to the development of nuclear power generation has developed and this, apparently, will last for many years to come. At some point, we will come back to this issue. At present, we have to go for constantly improving and perfecting the standard and quality of designs, the quality of construction, and improving environmental protection. Comrades, in the long run there is no alternative to the development of nuclear power generation. I am profoundly convinced of that. However, we will discuss this with you in 10 or 15 years. [passages omitted]

For now, the construction of nuclear power stations in our country is restricted to a lesser degree than we expected. As far as the prices for resources—oil, gas, and timber—are concerned, this is one of the basic categories. I agree with you that the prices for fuel and energy resources are unjustifiably low, and they need to be raised. As I understood, the government position was supported by the deputies: A comprehensive reform of price setting is needed rather than a revision of some segment of prices, be these wholesale, procurement, or retail prices. As far as the proceeds to Russia from the sales of fuel and energy resources are concerned, indeed, the republic shoulders a maximum of the burden of providing hard currency for the country. The principles which are being developed now clarify this issue. I mean first of all the principle of republic economic accountability and subsequently regional economic accountability and local self-government. Each locality whose inhabitants produce fuel and energy resources should have a certain share of what it mines and produces. This is an axiom which is accepted as fundamental in developing the laws under discussion. Approval is all that is needed. The fact that Russia has always shouldered the largest burden is a given.

Furthermore, People's Deputy Anatoliy Aleksandrovich Malofeyev asked several questions on revitalizing the economy. He says that considerable capital investment and material and technical resources are channeled to rural areas, and gas mains are being put in there. However, this is not being felt locally as of 1990. What is the situation going to be in 1991-1995?

Half of the pipe allocated was used to fulfill the resolution of the CPSU Central Committee and the USSR Council of Ministers, which provides for a priority switch to gas in the villages of the Non-Chernozem Zone. While proposing a concept for the 13th 5-Year Plan and not giving up solutions to the problems of the Non-Chernozem Zone, we believe that it would be incorrect to reduce the amount of pipe allocated for other oblasts and regions. It is necessary to build one more pipe plant in order to find a way out of this situation. There were suggestions to build it in Tyumen Oblast. It is possible that we will successfully solve this problem by using plastic gas pipes. In general, this issue needs to be worked on additionally in the 13th 5-Year Plan. Unfortunately, as of now, there are no ready solutions. However, we are going to look for them together with you, and I hope we will find them.

His second question was: "We consider it incorrect to introduce a tax on construction projects in the processing industries. The condition of these industries is lamentable anyway." I agree. This is what the report also says: No additional taxes are to be levied on what is associated with processing.

Question from the floor:

In 1990, facilities of the construction and construction materials industries in Minsk Oblast were not included in the state order, neither were the capacities of the Minsk Truck and Tractor Plants. They have quotas for contract work, but the quotas are not supported by material resources. This will bring about "a tug of war" between organizations included and not included in the state order. The plan of contract work should be balanced in terms of resources.

Yu.D. Maslyukov:

Resources are allocated in a separate item based on the volume of construction work. We are now beginning to organize mutual market relations. Each producer of resources is at the same time a consumer of other products. As a producer, he demands the right to sell products independently. You are aware that the USSR Supreme Soviet unanimously adopted a resolution to the effect that the state order cannot amount to 100%.

Comrade Vitaliy Andreyevich Mosol said today: Give us 100% of resources associated with construction. However, this should not be done. For the next year, we proposed 97% to 98% to balance the situation as much as possible. We gave the quota amounts to priority industries. For example, we cannot but give 100% to a kolkhoz [collective farm]; after all, its chairman will not rush over to a cement plant which is located in another republic. Only large territorial administrations and republics are up to this task. It turned out that the supply for some construction projects amounts to between 60% and 65% after we settled with the agroindustrial complex and gave everything that was due to the development of the social sphere, education, and health care.

In the process, comrades, bear in mind that everything that is in the market now will not leave the country anyway—licensing has been introduced. At present, there are 14 million tons of cement and about 4 million tons of metal in the market which need to be sought. This needs to be done through the Gossnab [State Committee for Material and Technical Supply] which is aware of this.

Finally, I would say that the production of local materials in Belorussia is developing satisfactorily. In the Ukraine, this industry is developing well, and in other republics either satisfactorily or very badly. We need to tackle this issue on a daily basis because locally produced materials may come to account for a very large share of housing construction which will reduce pressure on central resources.

The following question has been submitted: New medics, mid-level medical personnel will be earning no more than R120 a month even after an increase in wages. Employees of culture and art—librarians, club and museum employees, actors—are no better off.

I believe that the issue was raised correctly. I cannot say as of now that we will resolve this issue in the 13th 5-Year Plan. I promise that the situation which has emerged will be considered very carefully.

Deputy Vladimir Nikolayevich Tuzov asked a question, stating that the three variants proposed do not safeguard us against either increases in the prices for foodstuffs and manufactured consumer staples or the growth of non-labor-derived incomes. I would like to hear your opinion on such an important question as the introduction of compensatory payments to the strata of the population whose real incomes are reduced by inflation, taking into account the index of the growth in prices for consumer goods, as well as the introduction of income declarations in our country.

What can I say? Vladimir Nikolayevich raises both issues correctly. We agree with you: Both of these things need to be done, both of them are envisaged among the measures we have submitted. The report made a good statement on this. Such adjustments will be done on the basis of indexing the price level, standard of living, and wage level. We cannot do without this because in our country the portion of insufficiently affluent people is too high.

Two more notes have arrived. Deputy Nosov asks that explanations be provided on the mutual economic links of union republics and the share of each republic in generating the national income and in the budget side of our country. The request is to provide an evaluation in two kinds of prices, intra-union and world prices, by the end of the congress proceedings.

I would like to caution you, comrades, against inflaming unnecessary passions with these data (we do have them available). At present, the system of price-setting is designed on the principle that a fiscal tax on turnover is added to final products. For example, if we are making a radio set, the copper from which the wires and printed circuit boards in the set are made is produced in Kazakhstan. However, except for the payment for labor, Kazakhstan receives nothing for this. This is why the fact that we extract the turnover tax from the technological sequence distorts the real picture of mutual relations among the republics.

To be sure, we made such an evaluation in the system of international prices, taking into account current world prices as of 1987. Still, if representatives of union republics were to assemble, you would not have enough convincing arguments for a discussion. The government measures propose a transition to the system of value-added tax, that is, at each stage of the sale of a product along the technological sequence its cost, the expenditure of socially necessary labor, and finally the cost of the product which includes all the components determining the price for this product are determined. In this case, mutual relations will determine prices. This is point one. Secondly, we will know precisely who has income and how much, and will have a foundation for correct taxation.

This is a very important aspect. This is why, Comrade Nosov, we can meet if you wish. I will show you the numbers and explain their advantages and disadvantages. However, on the whole the picture is still such that Russia loses more than anyone else.

There is no argument about it, the situation needs to be improved. To my mind, it is also correct that we should not rebuke each other.

Here is the second note. "In the cities, the number of cars is growing, and everyone finds gas for their trips. Meanwhile, rural areas do not have gas even for harvesting. How did it happen, how is planning done? Will there be an improvement in how this issue this resolved?" asks Deputy Malkova.

What can we say...? The agroindustrial complexes get increasing allocations of gasoline year after year. However, meaning no offense to the comrades, there has got to be saving in the agroindustrial complex as well. Several people have already spoken at the congress from various oblasts where there is no gasoline and motor vehicles cannot be fueled up. Apparently, the issue still comes down to the economical use of the quotas assigned.

What is being planned, what is going to happen in the future? The level of gasoline quotas for agriculture will be maintained. However, I would like to say that recently a very difficult situation has emerged in our country due to the rapid deterioration in the operation of railroad transportation. Strikes in Kemerovo Oblast, when it was impossible not only to ensure the hauling of the necessary amounts of fuel but also, more importantly, to provide for the complete processing of the fuel, gave the first impetus to this. Of course, we should add to this the well-known explosion of the refinery product pipeline.

Deputy Anisimova is interested to know when the Gosplan [State Planning Committee] is going to reconsider the norms for cutting trees in the north of our country.

I will tell you, Comrade Anisimova, that forests in the Soviet Union have three masters: the Minlesprom [Ministry of the Timber Industry], the Goskomles [State Committee for Forestry], and the Goskompriroda [State Committee for Environmental Protection]. It is clear that the situation will not change as long as this arrangement remains. As I see it, strict legislation needs to be passed, and the forest should have one master who would not just cut trees but would handle the issues of utilizing forests responsibly. Our country has remarkable experience of this nature in the Carpathians, in Karelia, in Leningrad Oblast. As a result, they get up to 6 cubic meters per hectare rather than the 1.6 cubic meters we are now getting. At the same time, the cutting is not decreasing, and the amount of forest is growing. In general, it is time for us to get used to civilized procedures for utilizing forests. However, I repeat that the problem comes down to three masters. I believe that the people's deputies need to intervene in this matter because we have been unable to resolve this issue by ourselves thus far.

Undoubtedly, tree cutting in the north falls within the confines of this problem. I promise to sort this out.

Finally, one more question: How do you expect to carry out the price freeze in practice, especially for the goods for children and the elderly?

Production of clothing and footwear for children and the elderly is planned at prices set by the state and in the assortment which is proposed by our social complex. This is how we intend to solve the problem; there is no other way to do it.

Comrades, I am done with responses to your questions. With your permission, I will say a couple words in summation in keeping with the time limit, taking 2 or 3 minutes.

I would like to invite your attention to a question of principle. All the words spoken from the rostrum of the congress hurt us mentally very much, especially when medical care, protection of motherhood and childhood, delivery assistance, and the development of the social sphere are discussed. All of this is understandable, comrades. We are not concealing problems. These sores definitely need to be bared in order to be purposefully cured later.

However, I am very much concerned about the approach espoused by Deputy Krutov. He proposed a supposedly new method: Let us take the average life expectancy and its moral component and raise it to a degree. I would like to inform you, comrades, that this is no new approach, this is no discovery of America. The approach to the issue of life expectancy was worked out by us in cooperation with the Academy of Sciences. We have appropriate mathematical models. We built a model of our society and man taking into account his life expectancy and the need to ensure certain conditions. However, given what we now have, it is, of course, unrealistic to set for one 5-year plan the task of taking man to the average age of, say 75 years, and ensuring for him the conditions of life which we would like to have.

If you read the report attentively, it did say that the government makes only projected estimates. It does not count how much of which food is going to be consumed. For instance, Comrade Popov referred to eggs. Instead of carrying out this major research project, it would have sufficed to just read the previous sentence before the table. We proceeded from social norms which at present are 100% substantiated. They cannot be proven to be the ultimate goal of humanity. However, these are the norms which are now accepted as the basis for calculating the 5-year plan by scientific establishments and the planning organs.

We should determine measures for revitalizing the economy and resolve the issues of the economic reform; we cannot do without it. Still, no questions of principle have come up in the course of our meeting with regard to the stages and approaches in the 13th 5-Year Plan. If this is so, I would like to express my gratitude to you though I understand that this is not what you have come here for.

The development of a specific 5-year plan is in store for us. We have yet to resolve the issues which you have raised here. I would not like to rebuke some people for mistakes or juggling the facts, though there have indeed been mistakes and juggling. I would like to tell you, comrades: Let us embark on developing the 5-year plan and programs beginning in the first days of the new year.

The First Congress instructed us to have 11 programs associated with social life. These are the programs "Family," "Motherhood," "Childhood," "School," and others. Let us keep in mind the fact that we will not fulfill these programs unless we produce the resources needed.

We need programs for power generation, transportation, and a number of others. For example, we cannot leave agriculture without a system of machines. This means that a special program is needed. This means that we should encompass all of these issues by the program and target method in order to accomplish as much as possible. Of course, we will not be able to do everything we would like to do in 5 years. However, we can take a major step in resolving all pressing issues, especially social, if we indeed give them priority.

If it is so, we are taking the right path. Consolidation of all social forces should be the foundation for carrying out all of these programs. We should handle the issues of discipline and of monitoring the execution of decisions. I believe that we have a basis for embarking on specific work taking into account the draft laws which are now being considered by the USSR Supreme Soviet and the remarks made which we have written down and are going to study. I repeat, it is so provided that you do not object to the approaches which have been set forth.

One more note has arrived. Comrade Khusainov asks for an answer as to when procurement prices for cotton are going to be revised because regional economic accountability is out of the question in the absence of it and asks what my position is. It is as follows. Cotton prices were revised effective 1 October of this year. This was the second revision. In 1990, we will have these prices; from 1991 on, we will carry out the comprehensive reform of price-setting, as I have already mentioned.

Meeting chairman: I would like to thank the comrades who have taken part in the discussion for useful and very valuable advice.

From the floor: Yuriy Dmitriyevich, I sent in a written question which I did not manage to mention in my speech due to lack of time. The question is about officially designated flights. We respect our leaders, party and state figures, the government....

Yu.D. Maslyukov: Keep your question brief, please.

From the floor: I would like to still eliminate these privileges, even if isolated, small, and insignificant. This brings about disruptions in regular flights, delays, overconsumption of aviation fuel which we need very badly. Can this issue be resolved?

Yu.D. Maslyukov: The State Planning Committee does not handle the planning of long flights. This is, perhaps, the business of Aeroflot. I am just not informed about it.

From the floor: Yuriy Dmitriyevich, in your closing statement, you did not say anything about ecology, despite me noting that the concept presented by the government does not satisfy us when I outlined the position of the USSR Supreme Soviet Committee on the Issues of Ecology and Rational Use of Natural Resources.

Yu.D. Maslyukov: I will respond to you. I adhere to the same position as Academician Yanshin.

From the floor: We will come to terms with Academician Yanshin concerning this. Reducing my observation to what Aleksandr Leonidovich Yanshin said is uncalled for.

Yu.D. Maslyukov:

I would like to say that we should treat all numbers very carefully because when you say the number is R200 to R300 billion the people who know what that is are terrified, whatever others might think....

When you talk about ecology, I appreciate your opinion very much. However, let us just recall that the assignment is to work out a program until 2005. Is that not right? Such a program needs to be developed, discussed in detail, and the points which need to be accomplished should be selected from it. So, let us do this because we need to talk less and do more about ecology. Unfortunately, we talk so much that we have no time to take up this issue and study it in depth. In the process, those who talk the most do the least. This is what hurts. This is my approach to ecology.

Deputies Interviewed on Congress Results

90UN0570A Moscow ARGUMENTY I FAKTY in Russian No 52, 30 Dec 89-5 Jan 90 pp 1-2

[Interviews with USSR people's deputies by N. Zhelnorova: "Deputies Give Their Opinion"; date and place not given]

[Text] **A. Krayko, member of the USSR Supreme Soviet: "I Am an Optimist."**

[Zhelnorova] Will the congress' decisions change the situation in the country?

[Krayko] The congress has adopted an extraordinarily radical decision—the decree on commissions for the Supreme Soviet and the Constitutional Commission. This decree aims at the Supreme Soviet's accelerated enactment of new laws, specifically on property and on land and the preparation of the necessary changes to the Constitution on questions of the political system, including Article 6, the national-state arrangement, and so forth.

[Zhelnorova] Which main questions remained outside of the congress' framework?

[Krayko] Right from the start I have believed that the congress is a board of electors and has the right of veto. And it should altogether have handed all its legislative authority over to the Supreme Soviet. But we are as yet not prepared for this. Therefore I do not believe that anything has been left outside of the congress' framework.

[Zhelnorova] What worries you?

[Krayko] The friction on interethnic grounds. The fact that our Baltic friends are thinking mostly about themselves and failing to understand that there cannot be free Baltic republics, given a nondemocratic Russia.

[Zhelnorova] Your attitude toward opposition in the party?

[Krayko] I am not a party member, but I always welcome another opinion. The sole thing that I would wish would be that it work for the country's renewal. To speak about opposition in the party currently—this means opposition to Gorbachev, and I take a negative view of it.

[Zhelnorova] Your forecasts for the coming year?

[Krayko] I am an optimist and have hopes that the coming elections will make it clearly possible to create efficient and concerned organs of power, but mostly I hope for a 28th Party Congress which will elect a pro-perestroyka Central Committee.

E. Yusupov, vice president of the Uzbek Academy of Sciences: "To Awaken the Confidence."

[Zhelnorova] What worries you most?

[Yusupov] I am very much afraid of the possibility of mass unrest, like there currently is in Romania. The most important thing is to effect perestroyka peacefully, finding a common language of the leadership and the people. Many troubles and difficulties have built up with us which cannot be resolved at a stroke; this is unrealistic. But the true path will not be found at mass meetings and demonstrations, but only in actual labor. Everyone in our country now has begun to get involved in politics, but far from everyone knows how to work intelligently and sensibly.

[Zhelnorova] Your forecasts for next year?

[Yusupov] We can only scoop up what is in the pot. Currently the pot is almost empty. The government program takes into account, to some extent, the situation in the country and formulates practicable approaches. Next year will be transitional and more intelligent in terms of management methods. We need to manage not from the top, but from below. We need to introduce real economic accountability in the enterprises themselves. Without it, republic economic accountability is a myth. We need to think not only about big things, but also on a small scale—the enterprises which feed and clothe us. We need to develop leasing. There is a great deal of talk about this, but nothing practical.

We will create more obstacles on this path: We will sell them equipment at high prices. The leaser will try it out, but will subsequently have no desire for such leasing. And regarding the cooperative system, there are more obstacles than assistance for us. But the cooperative system means initiative; until people have initiative, there will be no progress.

For 7 decades we have conducted trials with the Soviet people and experimented at will. Faith in our decisions and laws has thus been weakened in the population and killed off.

We need to awaken confidence so that people know that the future will not mean de-kulakization or a new elimination of the NEP [New Economic Policy]. When a person is confident, he will work not only for the morrow but with regard for the long term also.

G. Popov, chief editor of the journal VOPROSY EKONOMIKI: "As Go the Elections, So Will Life."

[Zhelnorova] What kind of year will 1990 be for the country, in your view?

[Popov] Everything will be decided, I believe, in two elections: Republic and local soviets, and the party. If the people find within themselves the strength to change the situation in the local elections and if conditions are created in the party for its constructive reorganization, my forecast is a favorable one.

If, however, in either case there are no fundamental changes, I foresee perestroyka encountering very big difficulties.

[Zhelnorova] Things will either get better or worse, this is clear, but what is your feeling, for all that?

[Popov] I have faith in the sober mind of the people, in the fact that they will seek change. If this is not achieved in the coming elections, other channels will be sought, since there is no alternative to perestroyka.

[Zhelnorova] Is your Interregional Group diverging into an opposition?

[Popov] We believe that there continue to be possibilities for the constructive development of perestroyka under the leadership of those who initiated it; and it would be entirely wrong to separate into an opposition in the classical form in which it should form an alternative on all issues, including the creation of a shadow cabinet.... We believe that the situation in the country is not such. We support the initiators of perestroyka, although we also criticize them and are putting forward a variety of demands, but believe that currently the real force of perestroyka is the country's present leadership.

It is an invention of the conservatives that we are posing the question of a change in leadership. This question is being posed only by the conservatives. Remember the Leningrad meeting.

[Zhelnorova] Has your participation in the congress influenced a change in the situation in the country for the better?

[Popov] Undoubtedly. Were it not for our strenuous struggle at this time, we would hardly have had Mikhail Sergeyevich's statement to the effect that we need to accelerate the adoption of a radical solution and convene an extra Supreme Soviet. He essentially expressed an understanding of our misgivings regarding the government program, and in fact, advanced a constructive approach on many issues.

Ye. Rakhmadiyev, first secretary of the Kazakh Composers Union Board: "We Need To Take All That Is Reasonable."

[Zhelnorova] Do you think that the congress has justified the people's expectations?

[Rakhmadiyev] There has been some progress on some issues. We in the Supreme Soviet have shaped many bills, but, given the present situation, we could have worked even more efficiently. The people are tired of waiting. I am not convinced that in the next year or two we will be able to change the people's position even with radical solutions.

[Zhelnorova] Which main questions remained outside of the congress' framework?

[Rakhmadiyev] We should have enacted laws on property, on land, on state-owned enterprises, and on language.

[Zhelnorova] Did the Supreme Soviet prove stronger than the congress?

[Rakhmadiyev] In the sense of ethics and experience, the Supreme Soviet did more work than the congress. A certain parliamentary culture emerged, and for this reason it is stronger.

[Zhelnorova] Your attitude toward the party opposition?

[Rakhmadiyev] I would put myself in the independent category. I like much of what the Interregional Group is advancing. In this respect, we need a balanced approach, no matter where it comes from: from the left, from the right, from the center, we need to take all that is reasonable.

[Zhelnorova] But, for all that, in terms of your views with whom would you rank yourself?

[Rakhmadiyev] I cannot say that I am permanently on one side. This depends on who is making the proposal and how. The ultimate aim is to help improve the people's life.

[Zhelnorova] What troubles you?

[Rakhmadiyev] The growing tension in interethnic relations. This troubles me considerably more than the economy. There is practically no region in our country where things are calm.

G. Filshin, head of a department of the USSR Academy of Sciences Siberian Branch Institute of Economics and the Organization of Industrial Production (Irkutsk): "To Help the People."

[Zhelnorova] Which main questions remained outside of the congress' framework?

[Filshin] The congress would have done better to have resolved two main issues. First, if it had accepted the resignations of those who are unwilling or cannot work in the Supreme Soviet. A snap poll determined that only 37% of the deputies intend to continue on here. This would have permitted an extra election from the ranks of the active people's deputies for the creation of a working body that operates efficiently, with an understanding of its responsibility to the people.

I believe that a constructive opposition protected by law is more important than the multiparty system which we had earlier in a number of socialist countries. And there was, for all that, a monopoly which led to the communist parties finding themselves in the back woods of political life.

We had an opportunity to learn from others' mistakes, but we are still learning from our own.

[Zhelnorova] Has your participation in the congress influenced a change in the situation in the country for the better?

[Filshin] It would be immodest of me were I to say "yes." But I attempted to make a professional evaluation of the government's activity, and this did not pass unnoticed either by it or by the congress' deputies.

[Zhelnorova] What worries you?

[Filshin] What worries me primarily is how to help the people. We will put forward the question of the Supreme Soviet commissions studying the congress' proposals in a specific manner. We need to look for solutions.

V. Advadze, director of the Georgian State Planning Committee Scientific Research Institute: "To Renew Relations."

[Zhelnorova] Will 1990 be pivotal for our economy?

[Advadze] If we can make 1990 stable, this would be an achievement in itself.

[Zhelnorova] Did your participation in the congress influence a change in the situation in the country for the better?

[Advadze] I think not, because there were not enough people at the congress who supported radical change in the economy. And there were many who believe that it is impossible to take issue with the leadership.

[Zhelnorova] Which main issues remained outside of the congress' framework?

[Advadze] The political restructuring of our society and federation.

[Zhelnorova] What worries you?

[Advadze] Relations between the center and the republics remaining the same and the fact that no radical change is taking place in this sphere, in my view

[Zhelnorova] Do you consider that the government needs to be accorded special powers?

[Advadze] Our government is not suffering and throughout its history has not suffered from a lack of power.

Political & Social

Medvedev: CPSU Central Committee Meeting Set

LD1001085590 Moscow World Service in English 0800 GMT 10 Jan 90

[Text] A member of the Political Bureau of the CPSU Central Committee, Vadim Medvedev, announced that a full scale meeting of the Central Committee will be held at the end of this month to adopt a political platform for the coming 28th Party Congress.

The platform will contain some radical changes within the party to give more autonomy to party branches in the constituent republics.

Yakovlev Sees Lithuania Lacking 'Complete Picture'

LD0901155290 Moscow World Service in English 1210 GMT 9 Jan 90

[Text] Last week Mikhail Gorbachev, Vadim Medvedev, Aleksandr Yakovlev and Georgiy Razumovskiy met in Moscow with secretaries and bureau members of the Central Committee of the Lithuanian Communist Party and the Provisional Central Committee of the Lithuanian Communist Party adhering to the platform of the CPSU, at the request of Lithuania's representatives. They exchanged opinions on ways of getting out of the situation that emerged after the 20th Congress of the Lithuanian Communist Party. Our reporter Vyacheslav Terekhov has asked a participant in the meeting, a Politburo member of the Soviet Communist Party, Aleksandr Yakovlev, to comment on it.

[Begin Yakovlev recording in Russian with superimposed English translation] It was a conversation with very intelligent and responsible persons gravely concerned about the future of perestroyka and the revolutionary transformations in society, the future of their republic. I didn't notice any desire of confrontation in their speeches. However, they do not have a complete picture of the situation, especially the role Lithuania can play in making certain solutions and the effect of these decisions on perestroyka in the whole country. I believe they do not foresee a chain reaction and other factors, but I think that in the complex and deep process that is now taking place in a society such an understanding will gradually develop, the understanding of all the closely related decisions that must be made now.

Actually, the Central Committee and our entire party today want it to occupy new positions in society, positions of a political vanguard and that is not simple, not only because until recently it was integrated in the command and administer system and could not be simply removed from it by ordering it to have a new role in society. The time of orders has ended. Authority cannot be won by decrees and this means that in the new conditions the party will be moved from the command and administer system which is now dying away, should win authority by deeds. [sentence as heard]

I think that the Lithuanian communists, like the whole party, are concerned about this to a definite extent. The solution of this complicated problem should be carefully analyzed and considered and decisions must be based only on the basis of such an analysis. I hope that such decisions will be made on the basis of unity and accord.

Lithuanian Communist Wants Calm Gorbachev Visit

AU0901195290 Paris AFP in English 1934 GMT 9 Jan 90

[Stefan Bentoura report]

[Text] Vilnius, Jan 9 (AFP)—A leader of Lithuania's breakaway Communist Party on Tuesday condemned nationalists' plans to stage mass rallies during the visit here by Soviet President Mikhail Gorbachev this week and called for calm.

"We want a normal situation in the city for Mr Gorbachev's visit so that he gets an objective view of the situation," Party Second Secretary Vladimir Beriozov told journalists, calling on Lithuanians not to take to the streets.

Despite the threatened demonstrations, he said he was sure Mr Gorbachev would not cancel his trip.

Mr Gorbachev will try to coax Lithuanian communists, who voted last month to split with the National Communist Party and form an independent party, back into Moscow's fold.

But Sajudis, the popular front movement, said it expects a million people to attend two mass rallies here Wednesday and Thursday to demand "freedom" and "independence" from Moscow.

The timing of Mr Gorbachev's visit, expected to last two or three days, is shrouded in secrecy. It should begin Wednesday [10 January], according to the Lithuanians, although reports in Moscow said it would start Thursday.

Sajudis spokesman Rimantas Kanapienis said KGB agents from Moscow had changed Mr Gorbachev's itinerary in Lithuania for security reasons.

The Soviet leader is to address a meeting of the Lithuanian Communist Party before returning to Moscow.

His trip to Lithuania was announced on December 26 after an emergency central committee meeting in Moscow to discuss the Lithuanian split, which Mr Gorbachev strongly criticized, although he held off taking any decision until he had gone to the republic too see the situation for himself.

The central committee is to decide what action to take after Mr Gorbachev's return.

Mr Kanapienis told AGENCE FRANCE-PRESSE that the movement expected "a million people who will march under the banner of freedom and independence for Lithuania".

Special buses will bring in Lithuanians from the four corners of the Baltic republic, he said.

Sajudis will call for denunciation of the 1940 Soviet annexation of the Baltic republic, withdrawal of "Soviet occupation forces", and compensation for the "genocide" of Lithuanians, the movement's communique said.

The popular front, founded in the summer of 1988, now controls much of the republic's political life.

It has called on the Lithuanian parliament to declare that it is "ready to begin negotiations with Soviet government offices so that the friendly relations of both countries, based on the peace treaty of Lithuania and Russia signed July 12, 1920, would be recreated".

Lithuania, with a population of 3.7 million, is one of the three Baltic republics that gained independence following the 1917 Soviet revolution only to relinquish it under Soviet military pressure in 1940.

A central committee delegation, led by party ideology chief Vadim Medvedev, was busy holding talks with communist party workers Tuesday in different parts of the republic.

Lithuania's first party secretary, Algirdas Brazauskas, and his deputy were summoned to Moscow for talks last week, though little emerged of the meeting.

Politburo member Alexander Yakovlev said the Lithuanian leaders did not have "obstructionist attitudes", but added that they had failed to take account of the possible "domino effect" their action might have on other party organisations in the union, according to INTERFAX, a Moscow Radio news digest.

Meanwhile, Vladislav Shved, one of the leaders of the small Lithuanian communist party faction which has pledged loyalty to Moscow, said the visit by the central committee delegation was unlikely to change the situation as too much time had been allowed to go by since the split was first announced, INTERFAX also reported.

Lithuania, 80 percent of whose population is ethnic Lithuanian, has been at the forefront of growing nationalist agitation in the Soviet Union. In a bid to defuse tension, Moscow granted all three Baltic states economic independence beginning this year.

Sajudis Prepares for Gorbachev Visit to Lithuania

Rallies Organized for Visit

LD1001105490 Vilnius in Lithuanian to North America 0100 GMT 10 Jan 90

[Text] Sajudis, the Lithuanian movement for reconstructing, has called on the people of Lithuania to participate in peaceful rallies on the occasion of the forthcoming visit of Mikhail Gorbachev to Lithuania. The mass rallies will take place under the slogan: "Freedom and Independence to Lithuania".

As we have already reported in our earlier broadcasts, the first rally is going to take place tomorrow at 1 p.m. in Cathedral Square, in the very center of Vilnius. It is organized by the Council of the Vilnius Sajudis. It was also decided at a meeting of the Council of the Sajudis Sejmas yesterday to hold a mass rally on Thursday of all the people of Lithuania and demonstrate the determination to reestablish the statehood of Lithuania. This rally will take place at 4 p.m. in the same central square of Vilnius.

The Council of the Sajudis Sejmas has adopted an appeal to the people of Lithuania. However, it was not broadcast yesterday. The appeal was read out this evening after the main news bulletin "Panorama" by Kazimieras Motieka, chairman of the Organizational Committee, and Algirdas Kauspedas, member of the Sejmas Council. The appeal expresses hope that during Mikhail Gorbachev's visit people of good will would once again affirm their determination to reestablish a free, independent, and democratic Lithuanian state which will have close, friendly ties with the Soviet Union and other neighboring states. All this should be achieved by peaceful constitutional means.

Kazimieras Motieka explained in his speech on TV that those who could not come to Vilnius on Thursday should hold rallies at the same time, at 4 p.m. in towns of their residence. The organizers expect nearly 1 million people to participate in the Vilnius rally alone, which will end by holding a Holy Mass in the Cathedral and, maybe, in other Lithuanian churches. The organizers are inviting people not for noise and anger, but for dignified silence, the saying of truth, peaceful and orderly demonstration. According to Kazimieras Motieka, the rally of the Lithuanian people will be televised.

Vladimiras Beriozovas, second secretary of the Lithuanian Communist Party Central Committee, and secretary of the Central Committee Justas Paleckis visited today the Sajudis headquarters to obtain details of this manifestation. In the opinion of the organizers of the manifestation, Mikhail Gorbachev will not take part in the rally of the Lithuanian people.

Leader Outlines Demands

LD1001113390 Vilnius in Lithuanian to North America 0100 GMT 10 Jan 90

[Text] A separate appeal to the Lithuanian people has been made by the chairman of the Sajudis Council, Vytautas Landesbergis. This document has been delivered to the most popular newspaper LIETUVOS RYTAS. But, as we have been informed, it will not be published tomorrow. The Sajudis leader stresses that Mikhail Gorbachev should be welcomed not as the General Secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, but as the leader of the Soviet Union, the chairman of the Soviet Union's Supreme Soviet.

Vytautas Landsbergis writes; We invite you to go to the streets with the slogan Freedom for Lithuania, and support the following demands presented to the president of the neighboring state: namely, to denounce the aggression carried out on 15 June 1940 against the independent Lithuanian state and its forcible illegal incorporation into the Soviet Union; to withdraw the Soviet Army from Lithuania—this demand has been signed by 1.5 million Lithuania inhabitants; and, following the example of Lenin, give up all claims to the Lithuanian people, territory, and state sovereignty.

News Conference

LD1001094790 Vilnius Domestic Service in Lithuanian 0800 GMT 10 Jan 90

[Text] Vilnius—On 9 January, at 1800 local time [1600 GMT] a news conference took place at the premises of the Lithuanian restructuring movement, Sajudis. K. Motieka, Romualdas Ozolas, Zigmas Vaisvila, and Arvydas Medelinskas met with journalists.

The news conference's main topic was Gorbachev's visit to Lithuania and events organized by Sajudis during his visit. Lithuanian and foreign journalists took part in the news conference. Press representatives were informed about the dates and procedures for demonstrations and rallies.

Romuladas Ozolas replied to the question as to how Gorbachev's visit might end in Lithuania saying that according to his opinion the results would be favorable not only to the Lithuanian Communist Party but to Lithuania as well because they would be directed toward stabilization. R. Ozolas also said that Gorbachev is coming to Lithuania not on his own will. He is being sent by the CPSU Central Committee plenum and is entrusted with the task of solving the issue of the Lithuanian Communist Party in a way that coincides with the wishes of the CPSU Central Committee plenum. The plenum wants only one thing—the Lithuanian Communist Party to remain a part of the CPSU. The visit will show how much Gorbachev wants this. Our success will depend on how much we are able to resist.

Zigmas Vaisvila remarked that Gorbachev's so-called weakness vis- a-vis the CPSU Central Committee is a myth which is useful to Gorbachev. This maneuvering is typical of his policy. However, if Gorbachev does not implement democratic restructuring in the country a crisis could take place because as time passes more and more people become dissatisfied in Russia.

The participants of the news conference invited journalists to take active part in the events organized by Sajudis and give objective coverage of the situation in Lithuania.

Siauliai Rally To Support Sajudis Decision

LD1001102390 Vilnius Domestic Service in Lithuanian 0800 GMT 10 Jan 90

[Summary] A rally organized by the Siauliai Sajudis Council will take place on 11 January at 1700 local time. The rally will be held in support of the decision of the Sajudis Seimas Council.

People living in Siauliai and in the area around it were invited to take part in the rally, bringing plackards with slogans expressing the determination of the Lithuanian people to strive for freedom and independence of Lithuania.

CPSU Delegation Continues Lithuanian Visit

LD0901125790 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1210 GMT 9 Jan 90

[Text] Vilnius, 9 Jan (TASS)—TASS special correspondents report:

The inhabitants of the Lithuanian Soviet Socialist Republic are showing a lively interest in the visit by a group of participants of the CPSU Central Committee December plenum which, in accordance with a decision of the plenum, is meeting communists and work collectives of the republic, as well as scientific and cultural figures. These meetings continued during the first half of today. Yuriy Maslyukov, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and first deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers, made a trip to the city of Klaipeda, where he met workers and engineers of the "Baltiya" shipbuilding works.

Vadim Medvedev, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and secretary of the Central Committee Politburo, made a trip to Kaisiadorys Rayon, where he visited workers at a local farm. A trip to Kaunas and a meeting with the work collective of the "Koordinate" Association are planned for later.

Friendly meetings with people involved in culture, science and education have also been fruitful. They have been held today by Yevgeniy Velikhov, vice president of the USSR Academy of Sciences, Boris Oleynik, secretary of the Board of the Union of Writers of the Ukraine and deputy chairman of the Soviet of Nationalities of the USSR Supreme Soviet, and Mikhail Ulyanov, chairman of the Board of the Union of Theatrical Workers of the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic, who are taking part in the trip round Lithuania.

Lithuanian Party Official on Visit

LD0901153290 Vilnius Domestic Service in Lithuanian 1100 GMT 9 Jan 90

[Interview with Algimantas Semaska, head of the Lithuanian Communist Party Central Committee Press Department by correspondent Algis Usas—recorded]

[Excerpts] [Passage omitted] [Semaska] First of all,the press supplied very insignificant information to the readers about our guests. Only a couple of names have been mentioned. We have more guests than that. It should be said that two Politburo members, Vadim Medvedev and Yuriy Maslyukov arrived together with a group of CPSU Central Committee members and candidate members. They are: V. Nikitin, first deputy minister of the USSR Council of Ministers, who is responsible for agriculture; Academician Y. Velikhov, a well-known person in the world; Mikhail Ulyanov, a famous actor—he was shown on TV yesterday. Leaders of the party of other republics and oblasts also are in the group. Islam Karimov, first secretary of the Uzbek Soviet Socialist Republic Communist Party Central Committee; Vladimir Grigoryev, first secretary of the party Vytebsk oblast committee; Vladimir Kupisov, first secretary of the Volgograd oblact party committee—to count them all, I think the number would be much higher than 10.

The visit itinerary is set, however, while talking to the visitors, and the visitors talking to our people, the itinerary is changed very often. [passage omitted]

[Usas] What is your first impression about this visit? And what is the psychological atmosphere like?

[Semaska] It seems to me that it is perhaps the duty of Lithuanians to show hospitality to the guests. This is our tradition to give the guests a dignified and respectful reception. I think that at the moment any measures or organized events, any mass rallies which would make the situation more acute should be especially avoided. Our guests arrived here to clarify the situation in the party. Therefore, perhaps the large-scale rallies which are already being talked about here would only make the situation more acute and would hardly help Lithuania in the current situation..

It seems to me that the mood of the visitors is such that they are inclined to understand that the Lithuanian Communist Party did not have any other option except the path of independence and I even expect support on the part of some of the visitors. This is already heard even now. [passage omitted]

Maslyukov Visits Ignalina AES

LD0901175190 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1530 GMT 9 Jan 90

[From the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] [Announcer] We have just received a report on Comrade Maslyukov's visit to Ignalina Nuclear Electric Power Station [AES]:

[Correspondent I. Minayev, identified by caption] I will remind you that two power units are operating today at Ignalina nuclear power station. The construction of the third was halted following pressure from the public and scientists. The effect of the station on the ecological and seismic situation gives cause for alarm, they believe. The fact is that fairly strong earthquakes have occurred in these regions in the past, and who can guarantee that they won't happen again? One can understand people not wanting another Chernobyl. But what about the construction and power engineering workers? They believe that the third unit should be brought into operation. And their arguments cannot just be brushed aside. The specialists say that the sad path of Chernobyl will be fully taken into consideration during the construction of the third unit.

IAEA [International Atomic Energy Agency] officials who recently arrived at the station checked the radiation safety sytem and the degree of preparedness of the staff. Their preliminary conclusion is that the station complies with the necessary requirements. As we can see, conflicting appraisals, opinions, and interests, and economic, ecological, and social problems have bound themselves together into a tight knot. And it must not be hacked away, but disentangled, step by step, and everything looked into thoroughly before a final decision on the fate of the third power unit is made. This was the subject of a conversation between Yuriy Dmitriyevich Maslyukov, republican leaders, and station specialists.

[Begin recording] [Minayev] What future is in store for the third unit?

[Maslyukov] I would like to remind you that in February the government will be examining the first versions of the USSR's energy program, and the construction of the third unit has been entered into the draft of this program. In my view we must urgently examine all existing questions and seek solutions to them, and make a final decision. This must be done quickly before the USSR's energy program is approved. The northwestern region of the USSR as a whole is a deficient region in terms of electrical power engineering, and a decision must be made. What sort of decision this will be will depend on how quickly and precisely the question is tackled. I think that the scientists—especially those in Lithuania, because it is mainly from the efforts of these scientists that the expertize comes—should provide their findings as quickly as possible. These findings will be examined by commissions of experts made up of independent scientists of the Academy of Sciences, the State Construction Committee, the State Planning Committee, and other interested organizations, interested first and foremost in a correct and effective solution to this question. But a decision must be made by the fall session of the USSR Supreme Soviet.

[V.V. Sakalauskas, chairman of the Lithuanian Soviet Socialist Republic Council of Ministers] We stick to our opinion that it is important to us that the Ignalina nuclear power station operates reliably and with absolute safety, so that there is no repetition of Chernobyl at any section. This is the one thing we are demanding: We have asked the scientists, we have asked our own specialists, the USSR Academy of Sciences, and union organizations to help us to sort things out. We have a whole number of unsolved questions and unsolved problems—geological, seismic problems, and finally the cooling and water spheres. Let's solve these questions, dot the i's and cross the t's, and then we'll make a final decision. I agree with Yuriy Dmitriyevich, who said that we must speed up our preparation of answers to questions which have been raised. We really must speed them up as they have dragged on for a long time. It may be that we have set too difficult questions because the scientists don't have an answer to them. In that case, the scientists should get a move on and give us a guarantee that this will not be repeated. [end recording]

Medvedev Questions Independence

LD0901233290

[Editorial Report] Moscow Television Service in Russian at 1800 GMT on 9 January in its "Vremya" newscast broadcasts a 3-minute report by D. Biryukov, A. Paulyus, and V. Vyazov from Vilnius on Medvedev and Maslyunkov's visit to Lithuania. Biryukov begins his report with a comment on the various pickets near the House of Culture of the (?Pravena) Collective Farm in Kaisidorys Rayon, not far from Kaunas, which "reflected the sentiments of all those who had gathered to meet Comrade Medvedev and other comrades who had arrived in Lithuania on the instructions of the CPSU Central Committee. Well, these placards were there and we decided to show them." The video shows placards, reading in Russian: "Freedom for Lithuania!" "We are not afraid of a blockade if democracy is on our side!" "We are in favor of an independent Lithuania" and "The start of a law-governed state lies in the legal understanding of the past!"

Biryukov asks: "How can one separate emotions—which are frequently being roused by those for whom precisely such a course of events is advantageous—from a businesslike discussion of the problems which make up our present-day life? This is what the conversation—at times far from simple, but very necessary—in the square in front of the House of Culture and in the hall a little later was about."

Medvedev, shown looking at the "Independent Lithuania" placard, asks: "An independent Lithuania—what does that mean? You want to leave the union? Yes—that slogan over there—what does it mean? Or no? Or no?" An unidentified woman, just to the right of Medvedev says: "Yes, we are in favor of a free Lithuania, but within the framework of a federation." Medvedev then says: "What do the comrades say who are holding this banner? What does it mean? Is it in favor of leaving the union, or not in favor of leaving the union?" An unidentified women to the left of him says: "Well, all this will be decided by everyone, how we will do this." Medvedev then replies: "Ah, so everything will be decided by all of us, that's right, yes. That's right! For there to be independence, for there to be rights, for sovereignty to be fleshed out with real content—we are in favor of that, we are not against that, we are all in favor of that; and the reform is leading up to this." At this point an unseen woman interrupts: "Well, that remains to be seen." Medvedev asks her to repeat what she said. The woman repeats herself and Medvedev then replies: "Ah, of course, we will judge from deeds and from everything, from real deeds and not from words and not from slogans even."

Another placard shown at this point says: "For cooperation on an equal basis." The video shows Medvedev with Karimov and Brazauskas walking.

Biryukov then continues: "The conversation, or more precisely the discussion in the hall of the collective farm's House of Culture flared up at once around the decisions of the 20th Lithuanian Communist Party Congress. Vadim Andreyevich at once expressed his attitude to the decisions of the congress, but he listened closely to the views of those who spoke. People spoke in Russian and in Lithuanian. These were impassioned, frank, not always balanced, and sometimes unflattering remarks. The majority defended the idea of an independent Lithuanian Communist Party. Those speakers who touched on the question of the republic's future said that they are in favor of a free Lithuania within the composition of the USSR; that leaving the USSR is a thoughtless, erroneous step. Speaking at the meeting were Algirdas Brazauskas, first secretary of the Lithuanian Communist Party Central Committee, and Mikolas Burakyavichyus, secretary of the provisional Central Committee of the Lithuanian Communist Party on the platform of the CPSU." The video shows speakers, including Medvedev, Brazauskas, and Burakyavichyus.

Biryukov continues: "Comrade Medvedev's conversations in the shops of the (Koordinaty) Machine-Tool Building Association in Kaunas, in the Kaunas City Party Committee and at the meeting with labor veterans passed off in just such a vigorous, frank, and lively way. Vadim Andreyevich Medvedev was accompanied by Islam Abduganiyevich Karimov, first secretary of the Central Committee of the Uzbekistan Communist Party."

Further Activities

LD0901225890 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1900 GMT 9 Jan 90

[Text] The population of the Lithuanian SSR [Soviet Socialist Republic] is showing keen interest in the visit here by a group of participants in the December plenum of the CPSU Central Committee, who, in accordance with the plenum decision, are meeting with the republic's communist and labor collectives, as well as men of science and culture.

Maslyukov, CPSU Central Committee politburo member and first deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers, travelled to the city of Klaipeda where he met workers and engineers of the Baltiya shipyard.

Medvedev, member of the Politburo and secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, went to Kaisiadorys Rayon.

Also fruitful were friendly meetings with men of culture, science and education. These were held by Velikhov, vice-president of the USSR Academy of Sciences; Oleynik, secretary of the Board of the Union of Writers of the Ukraine and deputy chairman of the Soviet of Nationalities of the USSR Supreme Soviet, and Ulyanov, chairman of the Board of the Union of Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic Thespians, who are taking part in the trip to Lithuania.

Medvedev, Maslyukov Hold Meetings

LD0901220290 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1943 GMT 9 Jan 90

[Text] Vilnius, 9 Jan (TASS)—TASS Special Correspondent: Meetings are continuing in the Lithuanian Soviet Socialist Republic between the group of participants in the CPSU Central Committee plenum and communists, party organizations and labor collectives of the republic. An intensive exchange of views is underway on methods of realising Lithuania's economic independence and on the development of the USSR, as well as a search for mutually acceptable approaches to resolving problems that arose after the 20th Lithuanian Communist Party Congress.

On Tuesday, Vadim Medvedev, member of the Politburo and secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, met with labor collectives. In the course of frank and thorough conversations with industrial and agricultural workers and members of the intelligentsia, the most acute matters of concern to people were raised. The opinion was voiced that the social tension that had arisen in the republic must on no account take the form of confrontation.

Vadim Medvedev stressed that the CPSU is the initiator of perestroyka, and remains its main guarantor today.

He expressed disagreement with the opinion that the party was itself supposedly starting to hamper perestroyka and trying to suspend the incipient changes. On the contrary, he stressed, the processes of renewal now are becoming active in the party itself. The debate that was developing undoubtedly would enrich the everyday practice of party organizations and preparations for the CPSU congress.

Various aspects of the history of Lithuania were touched on at the meetings, which occasionally were given opposite interpretations. Attention was drawn to the need to see history as it is, and not selectively. One must not embellish reality, but neither must one suppress those positive results the republic has achieved within the USSR.

In the course of meetings between Yuriy Maslyukov—member of the Politburo of the CPSU Central Committee, first deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers, and Chairman of the USSR State Planning Committee—and the working people, many of them expressed deep concern regarding Lithuania's future paths of development in the situation that had arisen. They feel alarm for the destiny of their enterprises, and for their own destiny, for the course toward isolation from the Soviet Union could bring a sharp change to, if not break, their lives.

At issue is their own future and their children's. Among the collective of the Ignalina Nuclear Electric Power Station, as well as of "Baltiya," it was voiced repeatedly by the workers that decisions of the 20th Congress of the Lithuanian Communist Party were rushed, not well thought-out. In connection with this, Yuriy Maslyukov said: Democratization also means that it presupposes in itself mutual understanding. It is necessary to approach this understanding by listening to the opinions and reasoning of the different sides. It is necessary, while considering the real situation, not to get excited, but clearly and soberly to weigh all pros and cons.

Quoting economic studies and calculations, he illustrated how the Lithuanian national economy has grown over the years it remained part of the USSR. The speaker dwelled in special detail on the interdependence in the sphere of production connections between the republic and the country as a whole, and cited such specific examples as: the output potential of the Ignalina Nuclear Electric Power Station is taken into account in calculations of the energy program of the USSR, and to the "Baltiya" plant go the components and supplies from 13 union republics. To break these ties is like cutting through live flesh, and primarily Lithuania and its people, would fare worse from this.

Answering numerous questions connected with problems of ethnic relations, Yuriy Maslyukov gave an assurance that under no circumstances will the Soviet Government stop caring about citizens of the republic and their needs. Their social protection will always be guaranteed.

More Details of Visit, Talks

PM0901223190 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 10 Jan 90 Morning Edition pp 1, 3

[Report by own correspondent L. Kapelyushnyy: "Lithuania: Search for Mutual Understanding"]

[Excerpt] Vilnius—In accordance with the decision of the CPSU Central Committee December Plenum a group of participants in that plenum arrived in the Lithuanian Soviet Socialist Republic [SSR] on 8 January for meetings with Communists, party organizations, and labor collectives of the republic.

The "Zhalgiris" machine-tool building plant is not one of those enterprises to which visitors are taken in order to make an impression. It is an ordinary plant with a full array of socioeconomic problems. But the choice made to visit it was not accidental...

The following took part in the visit: V.A. Medvedev, member of the Politburo and secretary of the CPSU Central Committee; Yu.D. Maslyukov, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and chairman of the State Planning Committee; and a large group of CPSU Central Committee members, including well-known figures in science and culture and the leaders of oblast and republic party organizations and union ministries.

Of course, every meeting should provide a reliable cross-section of public opinion. And in this sense "Zhalgiris" is a mirror reflecting the frame of mind of that section of people which is now described as the Russian-speaking population. But most workers there are local, indigenous people. That is to say, the Poles, Russians, and Belorussians who make up the bulk of the inhabitants of the Vilnius area [vilnyusskiy kray].

CPSU Central Committee Secretary V.A. Medvedev set off from the entrance around the shops. He was expected. Questions were numerous. And pretty pointed. However, it should be noted that V.A. Medvedev himself gave pointedness to the dialogues, touching on sensitive areas like ethnic mutual relations and the split in the party. Many answers went roughly as follows: We have lived and worked in harmony for decades and never taken account of what blood flows in someone's veins, but now in the worker collective we live in harmony inside the plant, as it were, while outside...

Iosif Valtsevich, a team leader and a Pole, whose forebears also lived in the Vilnius area, said bitterly that the insults addressed to the "locals" [ironic use of the Polish word tutejszy], as the Poles have begun to be called, can be heard not just in the buses but in the mass media. Does his sense of grievance apply to all Lithuanians? Not at all. "There is a Lithuanian in my team, we have worked together for almost 40 years and I would not swap for my own brother. He is a first-rate specialist and will carry out any operation, he is reliable both inside and outside the plant."

It would be a mistake to think that the split in the party has taken place solely on the basis of nationality. But it is not without its considerable influence. The Russian-language-speaking "Zhalgiris" plant is therefore one of the bulwarks of the supporters of CPSU unity. N. Kozin, a worker in the assembly shop and a Communist, considered that discussion in the republic party organization and the extraordinary congress of the Lithuanian Communist Party that resulted from it have substantially reduced party organizations' strength and influence.

"Previously the shop party organization exerted an influence upon social and production life. Now that influence can be neither seen nor heard. Many party members are simply at a loss and do not know whom to side with. Many people, because of the unstable political situation, are simply biding their time to see 'how it will turn out.'"

"I will tell you my opinion," chipped in a worker from a group which had only just turned up. "If there is a split many people will not switch anywhere, they will simply leave the party..."

"Not everyone thinks that way," said one man still hot from work as he jostled his way from the back row toward the center of the circle. "I, for example, am in favor of an autonomous Lithuanian Communist Party. The CPSU is trailing along in the wake of perestroyka, while the Lithuanian Communist Party Central Committee will, once it is independent, have a greater chance of establishing its authority and carrying the people with it..." The standpoint of Pyatras Svidras—which was how he introduced himself—was not to the liking of many and there was murmuring, but the Politburo member asked people also to show respect for such an opinion. A conversation started up.

I will take the liberty of digressing from this sequential exposition of events. Perestroyka in the party is lagging behind, and not just in Pyatras Svidras' opinion—many people speak about it. But I want to draw attention to the fact that it was not just one brave soul who ventured to contradict the CPSU Central Committee secretary. Aleksey Rusak, a shop chief, diverged from V.A. Medvedev in his view on our economic problems. And here too the unusual "I will venture to disagree with you" was heard.

After the conversation in the plant shops discussion continued in the plant club, which was absolutely crammed full. After V.A. Medvedev had expounded on the CPSU Central Committtee opinion on the republic communist party split, a number of workers and engineers spoke. And again I would like to say that it seems to me that timidity in the face of high officials has been consigned to the past. Many sharp and, I admit, even offensive things were said about the leaders of the republic communist party. Veteran and worker A. Mishakov and fitter V. Karachuk accused the Lithuanian Communist Party Central Committee of complicity and accomodation. The Central Committee stayed quiet when the party was subjected to unwarranted attacks and when the honor and dignity of veterans who had fought the fascists was insulted and fighters for people's power were equated with the nationalist underground which had spilt innocent blood.

Sharp criticism of the party was made by V. Zhalo, a nonparty person who is chief of the plant's automatic control systems department. Usually the reproaches that people are fed up waiting for results, that the stock of trust is exhausted, that the endless delays will lead nowhere, and that fundamental measures are needed go down well with listeners. Here no. V. Zhalo's knowledge of history let him down. He raised an objection to the thesis heard at the CPSU Central Committee plenum that Communist should not be transferred en bloc from one party to another, this is the right of choice of everyone. "But who asked the Communists of Lithuania for their agreement when they were all transferred to the All-Union Communist Party (Bolsheviks) [VKP(b)] in 1940?"

It transpires that they were asked. To join the VKP(b) Communists with huge experience in the underground had to be recommended, they had to be admitted to a primary organization and work their way up. Professor and historian M. Burokyavichyus, secretary of the Provisional Central Committee of the Lithuanian Communist Party (CPSU platform), supplied information here.

"We have heard out your opinion today," A. Brazauskas said, "but it is no secret to anyone that there exists another, contrary opinion. How are we too find the the golden rule? After all the Communists of Kaunas, for example, adopt a different stance and have their own arguments... But alongside the difficult disputes about life inside the party we should not forget the main thing—how to make our life better."

The meeting was also addressed by V.A. Kuptsov, member of the CPSU Central Committee and its Russian Bureau and first secretary of the Vologda Oblast party committee; A. Menshakov, chief plant designer; V. Zhalo, chief of the automatic control systems department; V. Korachev, a fitter; and other enterprise workers.

A difficult search for ways of achieving mutual understanding is currently under way in Lithuania's worker collectives. [passage omitted]

Yazov Meets With Lithuanian Deputies 13 Dec

LD0901151890 Vilnius TIESA in Lithuanian
15 Dec 89 pp 1, 3

[Report by TIESA Special Correspondent Vilius Kavaliauskas on a 13 December meeting at the Lithuanian SSR Embassy in Moscow between USSR Defense Minister Dmitriy Yazov, Army General A. Lizichev, Deputy Defense Minister Army General D. Sukhorukov, and Colonel General F. Kuzmin, Chief of the Baltic Military District, with USSR Supreme Soviet Deputies K. Motieka, V. Statulevicius, J. Olekas, V. Landsbergis, M.

Laurinkus, E. Bickauskas, A. Brazauskas, R. Gudaitis, A. Cekuolis Z. Vaisvila, N. Medvedevas, V. Tomkus; and V. Sakalauskas, Chairman of the Lithuanian Council of Ministers: "Lithuania And The Army—In Search Of Points Of Contact."]

[Text] Uniformed men, seated rigidly behind the long table, faced the Soviet deputies. I saw that many stars and starlets on epaulets, for the first time in my life. Three army generals and four colonel generals. Such was the entourage brought to the Lithuanian Embassy in Moscow by USSR Defense Minister Dmitriy Yazov. The entire leadership of our military might.

While waiting for our deputies to assemble, I asked nearby seated USSR Soviet Deputy K. Motieka, whether it was not intimidating for him to see so many generals. "That is not intimidating. What is frightening, however, is our lack of politeness." Apparently the important visitors had too long a wait for the hosts, at this late hour. While we waited, we sought the minister's "military prognosis"—on when the congress would end. "December 23d,"—unhesitantly replied the army general. — "You see, I am to leave for my vacation by this Friday,— I have not had time in the summer." The fact that the Minister of Defense was at work, was evidenced by the silent adjutant, who spent the three hours taken up by the meeting, quietly sitting in a corner with the special communications equipment.

Soviet Army and Lithuania was the subject of discussion between our deputies and the generals. In school we were taught the army is our pride and our shield. Today we learned it is our sorrow and our pain. This feeling permeated the atmosphere of the Wednesday evening conversation. Here follows its abbreviated transcription.

[Statulevicius] We have long awaited this meeting. We shall transmit to you the concerns and questions of our voters.

[Olekas] Before commencing to talk about current problems, I must recall the circumstances that bought the Soviet Army to the Baltics.

[Yazov] Are we going to talk about the Ribbentrop-Molotov Pact again? What is our blame in this? By the way, I was sixteen years old at the time. Could it be that even then, this was accomplished without the approval of the Lithuanian people?

[Landsbergis] Good, let us not discuss the past. We are concerned about the present and the future. Let us talk about the Soviet Army's status in Lithuania.

[Yazov] We are a state organization. The Soviet Army is an attribute of the state apparatus. How you treat the Army is your business. We came to listen to realistic claims.

[Landsbergis] Let us deliberate the historical and legal aspects of the problem....

[Yazov] Are you not a part of the USSR? If that becomes an acknowledged fact, we will discuss it differently. Currently you are a Republic of the Soviet Union and the Soviet Army is based there in full legality.

[Landsbergis] It may come to pass, however, the Baltic Republics might announce their independence. For this reason, variants acceptable to both sides, must be discussed.

[Yazov] In the event you leave the union and a political decision has been taken, we will discuss it then. We have no authority to discuss this subject presently.

[Landsbergis] We simply wish to state our position.

[Yazov] Why did you not bring up this problem back in 1945 (voices from the other side of the table: "Those who brought it up, wound up very far away").

Currently Lithuania is a part of the Baltic Military district. Finally, I am not at all sure, the Lithuanian people authorized you to discuss this question.

[Landsbergis] We received our mandate through elections, thus we speak on the voters' behalf.

[Yazov] Well then, you are now the government, you are the Supreme Soviet. We will act as you decide.

[Statulevicius] We wish to tell you about the situation in the Republic.

[Landsbergis] We ourselves have no desire for increased tension.

[Yazov] If this is so, why then did you burn a soldier's uniform in the square?

[Lizichev] Why are you distributing anti-Army leaflets?

[Landsbergis] Tension is augmented by every youth returned to Lithuania from the Army in a coffin.

[Yazov] Twenty Lithuanians perished in the Army in 1989, while during the same period, 991 perished in Lithuania as a result of accidents and crimes. We do not excuse deaths. We worry about each interrupted life.

[Landsbergis] What are we going to do when mothers go out into the streets?

[Yazov] We have received some letters that indicated you are urging people not to enter the Army. Our Army will not disintegrate because of some 30-50 people. This is contrary to the Constitutution, however. Let us rather discuss the questions for which you have invited us.

[Olekas] It is necessary to clarify under what conditions republics transfer defense responsibility to the Union.

[Yazov] This is another political question. You are the deputies, pass a defense law. We are simply the military.

[Medvedevas] It appears as if we are in opposition. Yet, we both seek to stabilize the situation. We must draw closer to one another. Our young men are afraid to enter the Army—and not the Lithuanians alone. Since a Baltic youth is "a bad soldier." This, by the way, is not the officers' opinion, but most frequently, that of soldiers like themselves. They are suffering because of non-regulatory relations.

[Cekuolis] The young men are referred to as "German" and "Hans."

[Yazov] Are we going to blame the system for everything?

[Medvedev] The soldiers return in zinc coffins and that has become a problem for Lithuania. Our young men are unable to tolerate service in the transpolar region. Lithuania is a small nation and therefore the loss of every individual is very painful.

[Yazov] I have made a promise to Algirdas Brazauskas that 21 percent of Lithuanian conscripts will serve in the Baltic area. In truth, 26 percent are serving there currently.

[Lizichev] By now, that figure amounts to 27 percent. Eighty-five percent of Lithuanians serve in regions neighboring to the Baltics. By the way, when army psychologists conducted a poll among the new recruits, 92 percent among them expressed a desire to serve further away from home.

[Laurinkus] The situation in Lithuania is difficult to control. Voters are demanding concrete measures from us. Reserve officers are also experiencing problems. Reactivation of national units, for instance, of the 16th Lithuanian Division, are being proposed.

[Medvedevas] Tension arises when nothing is being done. Sajudis is only one of the political forces in Lithuania. There are some who raise more radical demands.

[Yazov] I would like to inform you where all of the 31 thousand soldiers from Lithuania serve. More than 6,000 of them are in the Baltic Military District [names other districts).

[Olekas] Would it not be possible to renege on having Lithuanians serving in the Far East? Since almost several thousand Lithuanians are sent there.

[Yazov] I have spent eight years in the Far East myself.

It is an amazing area. It seems, Deputy E. Bickauskas here, also has served there and will affirm to that.

[Bickauskas] I have spent two years there and all the while I had to keep explaining why I was serving so far from home.

[Brazauskas] I also have the opportunity to experience pressure. General Yazov, perhaps I have not understood you correctly, but Chairman of the Council of Ministers V. Sakalauskas has also spent some time with You. Questions of military service arise from life. People become electrified and it is up to us to explain things to them. Lithuanians are only a tiny part, one percent perhaps, of the entire Army. When we have the occasion to come face to face with the mothers, we realize what a giant problem this is. Thanks to your orders, we are often visited by high military officials, who are clarifying conflicts. We wish you would take note of our problems. For instance now we have the spring call-up facing us, immediately three deaths have taken place. It is also necessary for us to have a dialog that is constructive.

[Yazov] You have expressed a desire to have the Lithuanians serve in a more concentrated, large group fashion. We have taken that into consideration. Look how many units we have, named after Lithuanian cities (names them as located in Belorussia, Turkestan, Novaya Zemlya and Primorskiy Kray areas). We are going to try to have more Lithuanians serve in them, in order to maintain traditions.

[Landsbergis] It would be desirable to have a more flexible Army leadership. If a young man is taken against his will, it becomes analogous to the Czar's recruits. After all, people remember everything.

[Yazov] You do not remember anything, you only select all sorts of history. It is clear to me why Sajudis needs national units. It is struggling for power and needs an army to support its government. You always talk about deportations to Siberia. I was born in Siberia and am not afraid of it. As far as places of service are concerned—who is going to serve in the GDR? (from across the table voices are heard: "Let the Germans serve there.")

[Gudaitis] It appears the Defense Ministry is struggling against non-regulatory relations, but without success. By restoring national units we would rekindle beautiful military traditions. After all, in 1940 the Lithuanian Army had been formed into a territorial corps. Later there existed the 16th Division. This type of decision would lessen tension.

[Yazov] In addition to Lithuania there also exist Armenia and Azerbaijan. If one were to establish national units there, real war would ensue. National units were formed, during wartime, only in order to collect dispersed national troops. They took part in the liberation of republics—Lithuanians fought against the Lithuanians who were on the German side (voices from across the table: "There were no Lithuanian units among the Wermacht.")

[Laurinkus] Are we going to see changes in the call-up system?

[Yazov] No, it is not going to change, as long as this USSR Constitution is in effect.

[Cekuolis] There is no mention of callup in the Constitution. Do plans exist for a mercenary army? Will the newspaper KRASNAYA ZVEZDA, which villifies the Baltics, be bridled? What is your opinion of alternative service?

[Yazov] A mercenary army is not suitable for our purposes. We need an army composed of cadres. By the way, you refer to us as "occupiers," at every opportunity, but invite us... to have a friendly conversation. Are you perchance trying to convey, through me to the leadership, the magnitude of your hatred toward the Soviet Government? As for an alternative service—the construction units serve that purpose. An oath can be omitted there. True, those sentenced for crimes also serve there.

[Brazauskas] Twelve thousand such construction workers were involved in construction of the nuclear power station. They caused many problems.

[Yazov] We are not going to eliminate the construction units. You may announce publicly, I intend to assign the fewest possible Lithuanians to construction units. At the same time, I wish to propose to you as deputies: If you learn of any more tragic events taking place in the Army, address a personal telegram to the Minister. I promise to dispatch effective General Staff investigators there.

[Tomkus] A commission of Deputies came to the conclusion: Tragedy would have been averted had there been Georgian units in Tbilisi.

[Olekas] The Lithuanian Supreme Soviet Commission informed you of 160 incidents of non-regulatory relations, however only 16 were replied to. It would be desirable to have military commissars react to deputies' inquiries.

[Yazov] Commissariats will be instructed to ask new conscripts where they wish to serve. Callup has undergone great changes. We have exempted all students and have made health requirements more stringent. We still attempt to assign Lithuanians in groups.

[Laurinkus] Republic governments must be informed of the number of soldiers serving within their territories.

[Yazov] You have already received a written reply to this question.

[Lizichev] There are certain questions we can not provide answers to. Only one—two percent of Lithuanians used to serve near home, formerly, but now it has gone up to 27%. We shall assign compact numbers of Lithuanians to units which bear Lithuanian names. We make an appeal, however, that officers' families be not insulted and children be not traumatized in Lithuania. Stop Lithuanian press attacks against the Army and it will not be difficult for us to deal with KRASNAYA ZVEZDA. I must protect the Army. In reference to letters concerning non-regulatory relations: The Ministry of Defense will not hide them. Such instances are decreasing, however, free-wheeling by "natives"' [?zemieciai) is on the upsurge. We investigate each unusual incident and penalize those responsible. I want to call your attention, that of the deputies, and that of the Lithuanian public to the fact: The Arturas Sakalauskas tragedy is not—a phenomenon of the Soviet Army, but an internal military phenomenon. Those are two separate matters.

[Laurinkus] Recently, we are discovering dialog with Army representatives. Lithuanian public greatly appreciated the decision, by the military leadership, to assign an airplane for the return of deportees' remains.

[Stakvilevicius] Our young men, who serve abroad, do not receive any publications of the so-called informal press, and others, as well. The problem of Siauliai Airport also requires a solution. It would be desirable to have its use extended to civil aviation, also.

[Yazov] We can not do this at the moment, because of unit redistribution.

[Vaisvila] Military airports pollute the environment. Fuel dumps are set up irresponsibly.

[Yazov] Lieutenant General Shaposhnikov, clarify this matter. We are prepared to set up a commission of experts, in conjunction with the Lithuanian Academy of Sciences, in the event we do not trust one another.

[Sakalauskas] Siauliai problems are endless; scientific investigations are needed. In addition, the problem of military forestry districts has to date, not have been resolved, although the subject had been brought up by the Republic's Government several times.

[Gudaitis] The test site near Palanga must be liquidated and the disbanded unit territory near Marijampole must be turned over to farmers.

[Yazov] If the Army does not use the land we will return it.

[Sukhorukov] As former chief of airborne units, I am in a position to state the 900 Lithuanian airborne troops serve in an exemplary manner. I would like to call the Lithuanian Deputies' attention, however, to the difficult lot of the military who serve in your Republic. About 2500 officers' families have no apartments. Keep in mind there are 1200 Lithuanians among them. More than 600 Republic youths are currently enrolled at military schools. Lithuanian quotas for the current year, however, are not filled—only a third of the estimated number have entered the schools. As far as Army casualties are concerned: The minister of defense hears every case personally and dispatches General Staff representatives to investigate. Keep in mind there are 4 million soldiers in the Army (the minister corrects him—3950 thousand). I myself have served in Lithuania and have many friends among you. Our relations were excellent and there exists no need to darken them now.

[Kuzmin] We are cooperating with the appropriate Lithuanian SSR Supreme Soviet Commission. Following Deputy J. Olekas' letter, it was decided not to call up 1,300 Lithuanian recruits for health reasons; service was postponed for 1,000, while 288 married men were left to serve in the Baltics and those who have families have been transferred to our district. Thus, our relations are businesslike, as they should be.

We have consciously included the sharp points of this dialog. Let the reader be aware this conversation was difficult for both sides. It was first thought the invited guests would get up and leave the beautiful Lithuanian-decorated hall. That did not happen because both sides understood they were meeting for discussion of business problems rather than a political debate.

As far as we know, this was the first time the Ministry of Defense has taken such a step. Minister D. Yazov deserves a word of thanks for this. A word of thanks is also in order to those of our Soviet Deputies who arranged this meeting. We have reason to believe this will truly lighten military service for our young men and will decrease tension during a difficult time.

Lithuanian Supreme Soviet To Meet 15 Jan

LD0901143290 Vilnius Domestic Service in Lithuanian 1400 GMT 8 Jan 90

[Summary] The next session of the Lithuanian Supreme Soviet will take place 15 January. The referendum on the soldiers' right to vote will be the first item on the agenda.

The presidium also released Yakov Kiryushchenko of the post of chairman of the State Committee for Material and Technical Supply. Romualdas Kaziravichus has been appointed in his place.

Agenda Noted

LD0901143790 Vilnius in English to North America 2300 GMT 8 Jan 90

[Text] The first item on the agenda of the Lithuanian Supreme Soviet session scheduled for next week will be the referndum issue. This was decided at today's sitting of the Supreme Soviet Presidium presided over by its chairman Vytautas Astrauskas. The sitting discussed once again the appeal to hold a referendum issued by an action group representing the Democrats Party. The referendum will learn of Lithuanian citizens' opinions on whether the servicemen who are stationed in this republic but are not permanent residents here should be granted the right to vote during the parliamentary elections and then again a month later during the elections to the local soviets. The Presidium acknowledged as valid over 300,000 signatures collected in favor of the referendum. The referendum would cost the republic about 1 and ½ million rubles, but it is doubtful whether the Supreme Soviet will resolve to amend the election laws it adopted several months ago to eliminate the need to hold the referendum. If the referendum does take place it would be the first occasion in the Soviet Union and the second in the whole of Eastern Europe.

The Supreme Soviet Presidium also decided to suggest that the Supreme Soviet extend the term for the nomination of candidates for the seats in the local soviets up to 1 March. The motive is to enable those who will not be elected to the Supreme Soviet on 24 February to run for election to the local soviets. Candidates for members of parliament will be nominated for 11 more days, and about 100 people have been nominated already. A new parliament will have 141 seats.

Girenko, Nishanov Attend Azerbaijan Aktivs Meeting

LD0901150390 Baku Domestic Service in Azeri 0204 GMT 9 Jan 90

[Excerpts] The republican party aktivs held a meeting at the Communist Party of Azerbaijan Central Committee on 8 January. Topical questions of the activity of the Azerbaijan party organization were discussed. The meeting of aktivs was opened by Abdul-Rakhman Vezirof, first secretary of the Communist Party of Azerbaijan Central Committee. Andrey Nikolayevich Girenko, secretary of the CPSU Central Committee delivered a speech. [passage omitted]

Andrey Nikolayevich Girenko answered the questions of the participants of the meeting.

Abdul-Rakhman Vezirov, first secretary of the Communist Party of Azerbaijan Central Committee spoke at the meeting of actives. Rafik Nishanov, chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet Council of Nationalities participated in the work of the meeting of actives.

Comment on Nagorno-Karabakh

LD0901213890 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1800 GMT 9 Jan 90

[From the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] [Announcer] The situation is again becoming acute in Nagorno-Karabakh, as seen by the explosions on 4 and 7 January on the roads linking the towns of Agdam and Stepanakert. This naturally led to the disruption of deliveries of food and medicines, and to the disruption of supplies to many inhabited points. Traffic along the main lines was restored today. Our special correspondent Aleksandr Barkhatov reports. [video shows small jet plane taxiing; Barkhatov standing with the plane to his back; shots of officials speaking on the tarmac with Nishanov and Girenko]

[Barkhatov] So, here we are at Stapanakert Airport. The situation in the town is very alarming. Shots already ring out. In a word, the meeting between Comrade Girenko and Comrade Nishanov with the people of the town is currently being postponed for an unspecified time. The members of the organizational committee who have flown from Baku—representatives of the organizational committee to monitor the observance of the decision of the USSR Supreme Soviet—have for the time being flown out by helicopter to the Azerbaijan town of Shusha. [video shows Barkhatov interviewing Girenko inside aircraft]

[Begin recording] [Barkhatov] Andrey Nikolayevich, how do you appraise what has happened.

[Girenko] The only path which can be realistic is the path of talks, the path of constructive dialogue, the path of searching for compromise solutions. This is the only path which can lead ultimately to a reduction of tension, to detente, and to the normalization of the situation. Any other paths linked with, say, with more resolute measures, with the use of, so to speak, more, that is, with the use of other...[pauses]with the use of force, in a word, I think that they have no prospect. [video shows Barkhatov interviewing Nishanov]

[Barkhatov] Rafik Nishanovich. It turns out that 2 days ago you were speaking in Nakhichevan, and now in Stepanakert.

[Nishanov] Well, the Second Congress of People's Deputies also spoke in favor of discussing the problem, besides what the Supreme Soviet decided. But the delegation of people's deputies from the Armenian Soviet Socialist Republic, from the Azerbaijan Soviet Socialist Republic, and from Nagorno-Karabakh appealed to the leadership of the Supreme Soviet not to discuss this matter again at the Supreme Soviet, wishing to seek ways of bringing the positions closer together. The leadership of the USSR Supreme Soviet agreed with this. We have arrived from the observance-monitoring commission the USSR Supreme Soviet sent. I want to stress again that it is necessary to seek the resolution of the matter by way of...[pauses] taking account of mutual interests...[pauses] by way of observing the positions of the (?commission), and not by way of confrontation. [end recording] [video shows aerial shot of fields, roads]

Foreign Ministry Group Visits Azerbaijan

NC0901122190 Baku Domestic Service in Azeri 0440 GMT 9 Jan 90

[From the Republican Press Review]

[Text] Newspapers today report that a practical [emeli] group from the USSR Ministry of Foreign Affairs visited the Azerbaijan Soviet Socialist Republic [SSR] from 4 to 6 January. The objective of the visit was to study concrete matters related to the quesion of upgrading the Azerbaijan SSR's role and broadening its participation in the Soviet Union's foreign policy. Abdul-Rakham Vezirov, first secretary of the Azerbaijan Communist Party Central Committee, and El'mira Kafarova, chairman of the Azerbaijan Supreme Soviet Presidium, held talks with the members with the group.

Viktor Polyanichko, second secretary of the Azerbaijan Communist Party Central Committee; Artur Rasi-zade, first deputy chairman of the Azerbaijan SSR Council of Ministers; and other officials also participated in the talks.

The newspapers also publish the text of an interview given by Nikiforov, USSR deputy minister of foreign affairs, to an AZERINFORM correspondent.

Nakhichevan Border Remains 'Conflict Zone'

PM0801223190 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 9 Jan 90 Morning Edition p 1, 6

[Report by own special correspondent F. Ivanov: "Dialogue Without Unnecessary Emotion Needed"]

[Text] Dzhulfa-Nakhichevan—The situation in the Nakhichevan Autonomous Soviet Socialist Republic [ASSR] remains difficult. Your IZVESTIYA special correspondent reports from the scene of the events.

...The Baku-Nakhichevan train passes along the USSR state border for dozens of kilometers. And the first thing that strikes you when the train enters the territory of the autonomous republic are the heaps of sawn-down and burned barrier supports, broken-off coils of barbed wire, and the trampled-down plowed strip that has been run over by vehicles... This is the sorry result of the events that for more than a week now have kept not just the autonomous republic but the whole country tense.

What, then, is now happening in Nakhichevan?

I was in Dzhulfa, on the territory of one of the border outposts. Here, as everywhere on this sector of the border, the traces of destruction were visible. I went together with Senior Lieutenant of the Border Troops V. Afanasyev, chief of the outpost, to the banks of the River Araks, which forms the natural border between the USSR and Iran.

"It was here that on 31 December a crowd numbering several thousand appeared after breaking through the barriers. They lit fires and and called out to people on the other bank..."

"Valeriy Vladimirovich, why did the border troops not take any action then or now? After all, everything that has happened here is in direct breach of of the Law on the USSR State Border, is it not?"

"We were instructed to use persuasion. And we have indeed tried to stop people and explain to them that their intentions are unlawful. But how can one influence an excited crowd that is out of control?... I was struck by my soldiers' self-control," Senior Lieutenant Afanasyev said.

I went out onto the streets of Dzhulfa. The appearance of a stranger in the small town did not go unnoticed—a crowd immediately assembled around me.

"For decades barbed wire has cut us off from our homeland—south Azerbaijan—which is situated on Iranian territory," one of the crowd told me, "for decades we have been unable to to see our relations. And, you know, many people have sisters and brothers on the other side of the Araks. We wish the border troops no ill, but why have they forbidden us to walk on our land and make use of it—after all, there beyond the barbed wire, there are 17,000 hectares of land, land which our stony Nakhichevan so lacks! It has been extremely difficult for us to visit our forebears' graves and see our ancient monuments—they too, you see, are also in the border strip..."

"But is there really no way other than taking all this by force?"

The crowd became enraged.

"But do you know how many times we asked the authorities about this? We sent letters to all the authorities, demanded, and finally set a deadline of 31 December. But no one listened to us..."

...V. Zhukov, chief of the Nakhichevan border detachment, has spent these days virtually without any sleep. The changing border situation and the unpredicatbility of events force him to stay in his office day and night.

"The border along a section of almost 150 kilometers has been stripped and is difficult to guard. We are sending out reinforced border details, but they are unable to ensure a reliable defence. The other side is also concerned. We have already received a protest from the Iranian border commissar regarding the breach of the treaty on Soviet-Iranian border regulations and procedures...

"Thousands of parents whose children are serving here are worried about their sons. I can report that to date there have been no unlawful acts committed against border troops and the local population assures us of their friendship. But, alas, many military servicemen have received threats against them. We have had to evacuate border troops' families from the outposts in order to guarantee their safety.

"On 7 January the situation on the border again deteriorated. A group of inhabitants of Ilichevskiy Rayon attempted to carry out fresh destruction, now in the section that directly abuts the border with Turkey. The border troops tried to stop the crowd. With the help of armored personnel carriers, trucks, and several dozen soldiers with dogs they blocked a small bridge beyond which an intact part of the system began.

A spontaneous rally took place on the spot at which V. Allakhverdiyev, leader of the local people's front, stated that the border troops were deliberately provoking conflict and that this was prompting the people to clash. After a short conference an utlimatum was delivered—either the border troops made way or in 20 minutes the crowd itself would clear a path and indeed cross the Araks. The situation became explosive and the border troops took the decision to make way for them in order to avoid bloodshed. A minute later and the system of barriers along the 250-meter section was smashed..."

Now, unfortunately, virtually all border barriers on Nakhichevan ASSR territory have been destroyed. The border remains a conflict zone.

Authorities Controlling Situation

LD0901153990 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1413 GMT 9 Jan 90

[Text] Nakhichevan, 9 Jan (TASS)—TASS special correspondent reports:

The situation in the Kakhichevan Autonomous Republic of Soviet Azerbaijan is being controlled by the local authorities, which are taking measures to prevent infringements of the law. Asetdin Dzhalilov, the party leader of this Autonomous Republic, stated this today to a TASS special correspondent. As has been reported, mass disturbances took place there last week, along the Soviet-Iranian border.

The first secretary of the Nakhichevan Obkom of the Communist Party of Azerbaijan noted that "the restructuring processes taking place in the country have had a specific effect on the sociopolitical situation in the republic. Above all, the events in and around Nagorno-Karabakh are stirring up a wave of emotional outbursts and causing an increase in social tension."

The long-standing problem of the return to agricultural use of 17,000 hectares of fertile land occupied by the border zone, in Dzhalilov's view, "has been particularly aggravated by the settling there of thousands of Azerbaijan refugees from Armenia and by the blockade of the village of (Kyarki)." The population of the Autonomous Republic is also demanding, he continued, that "the rules for contact between local residents and relatives in Iran, and border trade be simplified. These matters have not yet been locically resolved."

In the authorities' view, the damage caused by the disturbances exceeds R5 million.. Asetdin Dzhalilov noted that the border guards "behaved courageously and firmly. There was no use of firearms against the local population. There were no casualties on either side."

The Nakhichevan Autonomous Republic authorities have appealed to the USSR Foreign Ministry with a request to examine the issue of simplifying the procedure for personal contacts between inhabitants of the republic and Iran in conjunction with the Iranian side. A headquarters has been set up at the party obkom for the operational leadership of the stabilization process, in cooperation with the border troops.

Asetdin Dzhalilov said that no conflicts of any kind between the population of the Nikhichevan Autonomous Republic and the border guards had been observed for many decades. "Their relations," he noted, "are traditionally relations of mutual help and support in resolving matters of guarding the border, everyday problems, and so on. All this creates confidence in the rapid normalization of the situation on the border."

Newspaper Details Situation

PM0901141390 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 9 Jan 90 Second Edition p 4

[Report by special correspondent N. Belan: "Araks in Flames"]

[Text] Kirovabad, 8 Jan—Smoke from burned border marker posts and watchtowers is hanging above the border. Some people may find it intoxicating, it may cloud their reason, but there are fewer such people than those who are anxiously reflecting on the situation which has taken shape here and on the simple and patent truth: The state border is sacred.

Therefore, the actions staged by the leaders of the Azerbaijan People's Front [APF] in the border detachment sector in the Nakhichevan ASSR [Autonomous Soviet Socialist Republic] are causing all the more pain.

"In October of last year," detachment commander Colonel V. Zhukov relates, "border guards were presented with demands to move the artificial obstacles on the border near Dzhulfa city, to provide free access for the population to the Gyulistan memorial area and local cemetery. In connection with this, a commission of the soviet executive committee [ispolkom] and the Dzhulfinskiy Rayon People's Front, with the participation of border guards, examined this question 13 October and drew up a protocol. The border guards subsequently reaffirmed more than once their readiness to move the artificial obstacles to the new line as soon as the ispolkom and the rayon People's Front had fulfilled their commitments in respect of their construction. However, the People's Front failed to fulfill them. In December, during mass demonstrations in the vicinity of the border, they set us an ultimatum: Unless the barbed wire barriers along the border on the territory of Naknichevan ASSR are removed by the end of the month, they will be destroyed or burned down. Threats were made against border guards—if they tried to prevent this, weapons would be used."

Here is a brief rundown of the events of the past 2 weeks:

23 December. A noisy rally of APF members and supporters with the participation of representatives from Ordubadskiy Rayon is held in Nakhichevan. Questions of expanding socioeconomic ties with Iran, the removal of artificial obstacles along the border, and the creation of a commission to review the 1921 Kars Treaty are debated.

24 December. Members of the APF block a road in Dzhalilabad city.

In front of the Azerbaijan Communist Party raykom [rayon committee] building a rally is staged to demand that the chairman the People's Front be appointed first secretary of the party raykom. Later similar demands are made at a rally in Imishli city.

26 December. In the area of one border post some 150 local inhabitants march toward the signal system. Some of them are drunk. Attempts are made to destroy the signal system. The arrival of a task force headed by the commander of the border post puts an end to the unlawful actions, but threats to continue them are voiced.

28 December. Preparation of incendiary devices continues. They are stored in tents in a number of border post areas.

30 December. The Iranian side lodges a resolute protest with the Soviet border commissar in connection with the events taking place in the border area. It stresses that the lighting of fires, the use of loudspeakers, and the chanting of slogans, some of which are offensive to the Iranians, are a crude violation of the treaty on the observance of the status of the border between the USSR and Iran and requests that appropriate measures be taken to end such actions.

31 December. The APF mounts an action aimed at destroying signal systems. Several thousand local people take part in it and tractors and trucks are used. Local organs of power did nothing.

1 January. Unlawful actions on the border continue. At 1130 hours a rally opens in Nakhichevan. It is addressed by N. Panakhov, one of the leaders of the APF. He congratulates those present on a major victory for the "Border" movement (the title given to the action to destroy artificial obstacles) and proclaims the current week "'Border' Week." The participants in the action declare their intention to eliminate once and for all the obstacles on the border between Nakhichevan ASSR and Iran.

2-3 January. Under the leadership of the APF, local inhabitants' actions to destroy obstacles and ferry materials back into the rear continue. The APF circulates rumors claiming that the border guards approve of the actions of the informals. The fact that their actions are going unpunished encourages the leaders of the APF to plan extremist actions against Soviet party and law enforcement organs.

"Throughout the first week of January, including today, the situation in the border guard detachment's sector has remained complex," detachment commander Colonel V. Zhukov told me. "The extremists are continuing to destroy the artificial obstacles and threaten servicemen and their families. We have been forced to evacuate women and children from border posts and take them to safe hiding places."

"Viktor Konstantinovich," I ask the officer, "there was talk of casualties in Moscow...."

"Rumors," he answered. "The border guards have not allowed themselves to be drawn into the dirty provocation, they displayed restraint. They did not use weapons. Can you imagine what might have happened if even one shot had been fired! This is probably exactly what the extremists were waiting for."

In complex and incredibly difficult conditions the border guards—Russians, Azerbaijanis, Belorussians, and Ukrainians, servicemen of some 30 nationalities—are continuing to perform their duty, worthily carrying out the tasks entrusted to them and making no distinction between their own fate and the fate of the homeland. Their determination and loyalty to their duty on the one hand, and the political shortsightedness and irresponsibility of individual leaders and members of the People's Front on the other hand are what the fires which have flared up on the border in recent days have highlighted, border guards themselves say....

Tehran Radio Reports on Azerbaijan Gatherings

LD0901203190 Tehran International Service in Arabic 1730 GMT 8 Jan 90

[Text] Muslim demonstrations in Azerbaijan have not ended after a week, but they have become less acute with the announcement of the signing of an agreement with the Islamic Republic permitting movement by individuals. On Sunday evening, [7 January] gatherings appeared on the border during which hundreds of persons chanted Islamic calls demanding the opening of the border. We review this event in this report:

The acuteness of demonstrations and meetings held by Azerbaijani Muslims on the border with the Islamic Republic has declined. It was noticed on Sunday that the lack of reaction by Soviet border forces and talks between Azerbaijani Muslims and Iranian citizens on the banks of the Aras River have contributed to a great extent to calming the feeling of anger which had characterized the demonstrations in the (?Donbalan), Poldahst, and Jolfa, which are joint regions between Soviet Azerbaijan and Iranian Azerbayjan. They chanted Islamic slogans like Allhu Akbar and the meeting continued until dark. They talked for 4 hours with relatives in Iran who had gathered at the border in the piercing cold. The Azerbaijani Muslims brought with them children and women, and a cargo train made a stop in the area for 5 minutes and blew its whistle loudly as an expression of satisfaction and solidarity.

The Azerbaijanis brought with them a jeep carrying loudspeakers. One of them delivered a speech in which he expressed regret at the fact that the Muslims of Azerbaijan were not able to provide assistance to the Iranian people during the war. JOMHURI-YE ESLAMI published the text of the speech by this Azerbaijani Muslim by the name (Ramizov). He began his speech with the words: In the name of God, the Merciful, the Compassionate. He explained in his speech the stages of Islamic history and praised the late Imam Khomeyni, whose leadership of the Iranian revolution he described as a fourth revolution in the life of Muslims. (Ramizov) confirmed that the Azerbaijani Muslims had removed all the barbed wire and that they want to spend the Iranian new year with their relatives in Iranian Azerbayjan and to have free economic and cultural exchanges. An IRNA correspondent counted 30 government vehicles and 20 private ones bringing Azerbaijani demonstrators to the bank of the Aras River—all of them were big passenger vehicles. Karim Shafi'i, Marand city Majlis representative, confirmed in a speech across the border to the Azerbaijani demonstrators the need to discuss the issue of border crossing with local officials in order to make it legal. Thirteen Azerbaijani Muslims crossed the Aras River despite the freezing cold and met with relatives in Iran. A number of them returned under the eyes of the Soviet border guards and Azerbaijani citizens, while some remained because of the river's extremely cold waters.

These events point to the depth of the emotional and religious link between Muslims on either side of the river, while the Azerbaijani national feelings have become part of their identity. Marxism has failed for 70 years to destroy this identity. Its revival is very strong within the context of a general phenomenon which encompasses all Muslims. It is one of the factors in the changing international situation, which would not expect to witness such a change had it not been for the state of Islamic awakening, whose geographic area has widened.

It has been noticed, however, that western media strive to exploit these events in Soviet Azerbaijan to achieve its objectives and purposes—stressing the national aspect greatly while ignoring the extent of the injustice which Muslims suffered. What is needed now is more religious and political freedom, the reopening of mosques, the lifting of censorship, and the allowing of Muslims to express their Islamic feelings.

Continuing 'Tense' Situation in NKAO Detailed

Azerbaijan Papers Report

NC1001080490 Baku Domestic Service in Azeri 0440 GMT 9 Jan 90

[From the Republican Press Review]

[Text] There has been no change in the tense situation in the Nagorno-Karabakh Autonomous Oblast [NKAO]. Newspapers today report that skirmishes continue in a number of residential areas, including the outskirts of Stepanakert, and that vehicles traveling alone are stoned and fired on. There are also frequent incidents of hostage taking.

Correspondents Describe Situation

LD0901184990 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1600 GMT 9 Jan 90

[Text] [Announcer] Let's move on to a very painful topic—I mean the situation in Azerbaijan which, as before, remains very tense. So listen to what our special correspondents Islam Kuliyev and Leonid Lazarevich have to say about it.

[Lazarevich] I have just returned from Nagorno-Karabakh. Representatives of the union monitoring and observation commission and of the republican organization committee on the Nagorno-Karabakh Autonomous Oblast [NKAO] flew there today and began work. These bodies were set up at the beginning of last year to normalize the situation. I have to say that they face very, very complex work. Meetings were to have taken place today in Stepanakert with Comrade Girenko, secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, Comrade Nishanov, chairman of the Soviet of Nationalities of the Supreme Soviet, and other senior officials. It was with them that we, too, arrived in Stepanakert. However, we were forced to return from there by plane an hour and a half later. The road from the airport to Stepanakert was blocked with piles of stones. An atmosphere of excitement reigned in the town. There were clashes which resulted in casualties. Three people were injured, one of them seriously. It should be said that events are taking place in Stepanakert which are difficult to understand. Taking hostages there has become more frequent. Cars are stoned on the roads, and one can hear shots being fired on the outskirts of the town at night.

[Kuliyev] The events in Nagorno-Karabakh are exacerbating the situation throughout the republic. Unsanctioned meetings are being held. There participants are demanding the normalization of life in Nagorno-Karabakh and compliance with the Constitution. Although inflammatory appeals have at times been heard at the meetings, the situation on the whole was comparatively calm. So, yesterday, I was extremely surprised when the majority of those gathered on Baku's central square moved off in the direction of the Central Committee building of the Communist Party of Azerbaijan. Let me play a recording, which we made last night:

[Begin recording] [Lazarevich, speaking over sound of crowd] Thousands of people have gathered now in front of the premises of the Azerbaijan Communist Party Central Committee. I cannot possibly count them, but according to approximate estimates there are about 10,000 people.

[Kuliyev] If not more. People are still coming up from over on that side, from below [word indistinct]. They are moving in great crowds toward the premises of the Azerbaijan Communist Party Central Committee.

[Lazarevich] And more and more groups of people are approaching. Some of the people have already gone up the steps to the very entrances of the Central Committee building.

[Kuliyev]...And have clustered around them. It has never happened before that demonstrators or pickets have gone up these steps. Perhaps once an improvised platform was organized here, on that edge alone, but it has never happened that people have come right up to the gates. [end recording]

[Lazerevich] It seems to me that here in Azerbaijan passions at times get so high that people are in no state to evaluate the situation or understand it, or to hear the voice of reason. The events in the Nakhichevan Autonomous Republic serve as an example of this.

[Kuliyev] You will recall that an unprecedented incident recently happened there. Border installations were destroyed along a considerable stretch by the republic's population. After this, as you know, Comrades Girenko and Nishanov visited the area and met the local inhabitants. Now we have learned that a meeting between relatives and friends living on different sides of the Soviet- Iranian border was organized in Babek Rayon. Of course this is a happy event. Just imagine that Norun Mamedov, an 85-year-old resident of the village of Negram in Babek Rayon, met his sister, who he had not seen for decades. According to information we have obtained, such meetings will become regular.

Armenian Radio: Azerbaijan Motivated by Pan-Turkism

NC1001102690 Yerevan International Service in Armenian 1900 GMT 9 Jan 90

[Text] Developments reveal that Azerbaijan has placed a different construction on restructuring and has turned it upside down. Azerbaijan seems to believe that restructuring has provided the opportunity, starting with the Sumgait genocide and continuing to devastation all along the Soviet-Iran border, to act out long suppressed emotions.

What, in actual fact, do our neighbors seek? First of all, they seek to put into operation the ever ready mechanism of pan-Turkism; they seek the unification of the people living in Soviet Azerbaijan and northern Iran with the long-range intention of forging a policy oriented toward Turkey. The Azerbaijanis relied on the fact that this enormous provocation would result in casualties and thought to use this as a pretext for declaring a jihad against the infidels, the first targets of which would be the Armenians and then the Russians. The many barbarities committed by the Azerbaijan People's Front are directed at unsettling the situation in the region and threatening the center against making any attempt to find a just solution to the problem of the reunification of Artsakh [Nagorno-Karabakh Autonomous Oblast] and Armenia.

NKAO Cultural Groups Withdraw From Ministry

NC0901123990 Yerevan International Service in Armenian 1630 GMT 6 Jan 90

[Text] The collectives of cultural institutions in the Nagorno-Karabakh Autonomous Oblast [NKAO] have debated the decisions adopted by the Armenian Republic's Supreme Soviet and the NKAO National Council during their joint session in December and unanimously decided to withdraw themselves from the structure of Azerbaijan Culture Ministry, affiliate themselves with the Armenian Culture Ministry, and be governed by programs coming from mother Armenia.

The workers at cultural-educational establishments in Stepanakert also debated the other decisions of the

December session and condemned the activities of the extremists of the so-called Azerbaijan National Front.

Armenian Supreme Soviet Discusses NKAO

LD0901182890 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1600 GMT 9 Jan 90

[Text] Now, I want to cite some details of the work of the session of the Supreme Soviet of Armenia. The reports are by Koryun Khumaryan, our correspondent in Armenia.

The morning sitting commenced with a stormy discussion on the situation in Nagorno-Karabakh [NKAO] and of problems connected with the Nairit scientific production association. Let me remind you that, under pressure from the people of the republic, who were concerned by the ecological situation, the Supreme Soviet of Armenia decided to close this association from 1 January. The USSR Ministry of the Chemical Industry and Council of Ministers do not agree with this. They believe that Nairit's closure will reflect badly, not only on the republic itself, but also on the economy of the whole country. Numerous residents of Yerevan have received with approval the statement by Voskanyan, chairman of the Armenian Supreme Soviet Presidium, that the association's harmful production facilities are no longer functioning. The session took cognizance of this statement.

The session also discussed and adopted the plan and budget of the Nagorno-Karabakh Autonomous Oblast—note this, comrades—within the plan and budget of the Armenian SSR.

What can I say on this subject? Only that the two republics' Supreme Soviets still do not have any agreement or mutual understanding, or even attempts to achieve this, but without this one can not expect a settlement of the situation in Nagorno-Karabakh, in any event.

Armenian, NKAO Communists Seek Affiliation

LD0801135290 Yerevan KOMMUNIST in Russian 16 Dec 89 p 1

[Text] A plenum of Stepanakert Party City COmmittee [Gorkom] has discussed the tasks of the oblast center's party organization arising from the decision by the Armenian SSR Supreme Soviet and the Nagorno-Karabakh Autonomous Oblast [NKAO] National Council on the reunification of Armenia and Nagorno-Karabakh.

The rapporteur, Valeriy Atadzhanyan, first secretary of the Communist Party gorkom and others noted in particular that the decision by the USSR Supreme Soviet on Nagorno-Karabakh in effect envisages the enforced return of the autonomous oblast to Azerbayjani rule, regardless of the clearly expressed will of the overwhelming majority of the population of the NKAO which has been confirmed many times and enshrined in the proper manner in the decisions of its representative bodies. This document was adopted with unconcealed crude violations of international legal and moral standards. Thus the fate of the Armenian people of Artsakh has again been handed over to the complete control of those who have already repeatedly played a fatal role in it.

The error committed yet again by the center has been rectified by the Supreme Soviet of the Armenian SSR and the NKAO National Council which, guided by the general human principle of the right of a nation to self-determination and using as their starting point the legitimate aspiration of the Armenian people for the reunification of two parts of it which were divided by force, adopted the only just joint decision on the reunification of Armenia and Nagorno-Karabakh.

The plenum condemned and declared unacceptable the 28th November 1989 decision by the country's Supreme Soviet on measures to normalize the situation in the Nagorno-Karabakh Autonomous Oblast and qualified it as a new act of annexation under the norms of international constitutional law.

Taking into consideration the will of the overwhelming majority of communists in the oblast center, as expressed in decisions of meetings of primary party organizations, the plenum decided to ask the Central Committee of the Armenian Communist Party to accept the Stepanakert town Party organization into the Party organization of the Armenian SSR, viewing the decision as the way to reestablish the Nagorno-Karabakh Party obkom.

The plenum decided to implement all the necessary measures to merge the political, economic, and cultural structures of the Armenian SSR and the NKAO into a single state-political system.

[Signed] A Grigoryan, ARMENPRESS special correspondent, Stepanakert

Single Committee To Handle Armenian Repatriates

NC0901134090 Yerevan Domestic Service in Armenian 0200 GMT 9 Jan 90

[Text] In connection with the 11 December decree of the Armenian Supreme Soviet Presidium on the creation of a republican state committee for the reception and settlement of Armenians returning to the Armenian Republic, the Armenian Council of Ministers has decided to dissolve the committee for the reception and settlement of Armenians returning from diaspora attached to the Armenian Council of Ministers and the administration for the affairs of citizens who have left their permanent residences attached to the Armenian Council of Ministers.

The central administrative apparatus and the list of organizations and institutions subordinate to the state committee for the reception and settlement of Armenians returning to the Armenian Republic have been ratified.

The newly formed committee of the Armenian Republic has been instructed to formulate a draft text of its by-laws, which are to be submitted to the Armenian Council of Ministers within 2 months.

Armenian Culture Society Founded in Kiev

LD0901155590 Moscow TASS in English 1414 GMT 9 Jan 90

[Text] A Society of Armenian Culture and History has started its work in Kiev, the Ukrainian capital, organising Armenian language courses. Many Armenians live in Kiev and there are many who wish to learn Armenian, Ukrainians and Russians among them. Lessons are conducted by Armenians studying in Kiev's institutes.

The curriculum includes the history of Armenia and its age-long ties with the Ukrainian people.

Armenian societies also exist in Moscow, Leningrad, Tbilisi, Simferopol, Rostov-on-Don, Riga, Tallinn, and Tashkent.

Latvia Faced With Financial, Economic Problems

PM0901153990 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 6 Jan 90 Morning Edition p 2

[Own correspondent I. Litvinova report under the rubric "Details and Commentaries": "Latvia: There Will Be No Miracles"]

[Text] Riga—No, there will be no miracles: That is the realists' prediction for the initial period of Latvia's transition to economic independence.

The shelves of the stores were not groaning under the weight of goods 1 January, just as they were not on 31 December. It is becoming increasingly rare for shop assistants to ask customers for their visitor cards: There is nothing in particular to guard from outsiders. The last time I was asked to produce my visitor card was in a musical instrument store, where I was buying a guitar made by a factory in Kuybyshev. A notice on the store wall confirmed that "the majority of comestibles and noncomestibles, regardless of their origin, can only be sold to inhabitants of Latvia."

The republic's postal workers will evidently be the first to feel the effects of the changes for the better this year. Entire collectives have written to the Ministry of Communications demanding a revision of current rates and tariffs. If this is not done, postal workers are resigning from the job of delivering periodicals to subscribers, beginning 1 January. Several days before the new year the republic's Council of Ministers was obliged to allocate R2.5 million to pay the wages of postal workers delivering newspapers and journals. Obviously the money for this must come from somewhere. It has already been announced that part of the expenditure will be compensated, for example, by raising the nominal price of periodicals.

The maximum extent of the republic's state budget deficit has been set at R156.87 million. The Finance Ministry proposes to obtain additional appropriations by raising the prices of alcohol and tobacco products. This idea has given rise to great disputes among the republic's Supreme Soviet deputies, who have already discussed it. The results were summed up by the chairman of the planning and budget commission. He said that this kind of price increase will arouse a negative reaction from the population, who will look at this in the light of the republic's transition to economic autonomy...

Deputies have recommended that the republic's State Planning Committee and Finance Ministry publish their proposals in the press, justify the need to raise the prices of tobacco and alcohol, specifically indicate on what the revenue thereby obtained would be spent and in what amounts, and submit their proposals for discussion to the Supreme Soviet only if they find support among the population.

Changes have been made in the system of the republic's organs of state administration. In many respects they are connected with the restructuring of Latvia's economic mechanism with its transition to economic autonmomy. Yanis Aboltinsh, the 46-year-old deputy chairman of the State Planning Committee, has been confirmed as minister of the economy. This new ministry will replace the already defunct State Committee for Labor and Social Problems, State Committee on Prices, and State Planning Committee. A new Ministry of Industry has also been formed. True, at present it is not totally clear which enterprises are to be transferred to its jurisdiction. Material and technical supply is the cause of greatest concern to economic workers of various ranks in the conditions of economic independence.

The republic's Supreme Soviet recently rejected a proposal by the Latvian Council of Ministers to continue pulp production at the Sloka Pulp and Paper Plant until 1 January 1994. The transportation of nitralacrylic acid through the city of Ventspils must end in January. Each of these decisions, designed to improve the ecological situation, will give rise to serious economic problems.

Russian Orthodox Priest Reportedly Killed in Lvov

AU0901105390 Vienna DER STANDARD in German 9 Jan 90 p 3

[KATHPRESS report: "Church Quarrel in the Ukraine: Murder Reported"]

[text] Lvov/Vienna/Berlin—The controversy in the Ukraine between the Russian Orthodox Church and the Ukrainian Catholic Church after the readmission of the Uniate Catholic Church of Byzantine rites is obviously assuming dramatic forms. According to a report by Russian Orthodox Archbishop of Berlin and Central Europe, Exarch German, a Russian Orthodox priest named Vasiliy Botshalo was allegedly killed in Lvov. German's statement says that the legal recognition of the Ukrainian Catholics has caused numerous "plights for orthodox Christians": "Churches have been taken away from them, shrines have been defiled, and believers have

been beaten up." "Excesses" have been committed, "which can be compared only with the events from the time of the counter-reformation."

IZVESTIYA Interviews New Turkmen Premier

PM0901162790 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 7 Jan 90 Morning Edition p 1

[Interview with Kh. Akhmedov, chairman of the Turkmen SSR Council of Ministers, by IZVESTIYA correspondent V. Kuleshov: "Chairman of Turkmen SSR Council of Ministers Appointed"; date and place of interview not given; first two paragraphs are editorial introduction]

[Text] As we have already reported, a session of the Turkmen SSR [Soviet Socialist Republic] Supreme Soviet has appointed Kh. Akhmedov, who won the greatest support from deputies as a result of a secret ballot on a multiple-candidate basis, chairman of the republic's Council of Ministers. Khan Akhmedov was born in 1936 in Turkmenistan, in Kizyl-Arvatskiy Rayon's Parau settlement; he is a Turkmen and has been a member of the CPSU since 1963. He graduated from Tashkent Railroad Transport Engineers Institute. He spent a long time in leadership work in the USSR Ministry of Railways system. He was head of the Turkmen Communist Party Central Committee Transport and Communications Department and first secretary of the Ashkhabad City Party Committee from 1980. He has been first deputy chairman of the Turkmen SSR Council of Ministers since 1988.

IZVESTIYA correspondent V. Kuleshov asked Kh. Akhmedov to tell us what plans he has with regard to his new appointment.

[Akhmedov] Sectors with a union specialization geared to producing and supplying other regions with gas, oil, chemical output, and cotton have developed in our republic over the years. At the same time there has been virtually no development of sectors designed to serve the special needs of the Turkmen population and economy. Man, his life, and interests have not been taken into consideration. That is why our republic only produces R353 of consumer goods per capita—which is 3 and ½ times lower than the average union level. We rank first among the cotton-growing republics for per capita cotton production, yet children's coats and jackets, fashionable clothes, and dresses cannot be bought in the stores—they are simply not produced in our republic. Turkmenistan lags seriously behind in provision of housing, children's preschool establishments, schools, and public health facilities. These are questions which must be resolved as a matter of priority.

We intend to fundamentally restructure our relations with union departments, which have for decades barbarically squandered, so to speak, natural resources. This cannot go on any longer.

There is the possibility of developing an all-union citrus orchard in the near future in the southwest of the republic—the Turkmen subtropics. But water is needed. Early this year we will begin construction of the second part of a water pipeline to the west of Turkmenia. At present it runs from Kazandzhik to Nebit-Dag. We intend to create a mighty joint—with Iran—reservoir in the Kizyl-Atrek area using floodwater and flow from the Atrek River. The contract has already been signed and we will begin the practical implementation of the plan in the latter half of 1990.

Spread of Gun Ownership in Kirghizia Viewed

PM0901164190 Moscow KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA in Russian 9 Jan 90 p 1

["Our Correspondent" K. Bayalinov report: "A Gun for Every Occasion"]

[Text] Frunze—The subject of my report was suggested to me by an old friend who suddenly expressed a desire to become a member of a hunting society. Why is that, I asked.

"You somehow feel more at ease today with a gun," he put forward the incontrovertible argument.

Well, joining a hunting society is no problem especially in our republic, Kirghizia, where a "mergen"—a hunter—has been a most respected person since time immemorial. If that is the case, there must be quite a lot of people with guns and, correspondingly, quite a lot of demand for "guns."

"People are buying up absolutely everything," Shavkat Zelenkov, director of the "Zenit" direct-sale store, said pointing to the empty gun shelf. "They are taking the cheap single-barreled guns which no one bought before: They are not as accurate as they should be and are not at all suitable for serious sport. Whereas we sold 98 guns in 8 months in 1988, in 1 day alone of an exhibition sale last year, 1989, we sold 116!"

The picture is also the same in all the republic hunting society's other stores.

"We are inundating the republic with weapons," A. Kiryanov, deputy chairman of the republic's "Kirgizokhotrybolov" Union Presidium, said. "Where are the thousands of small-caliber rifles that were openly sold in rural stores in the sixties? The Kirghiz premier was shot dead with one of these guns in 1980. According to the most modest estimates alone, 25,000-26,000 people in the republic are armed—the equivalent of 16 infantry regiments! And what if you add to that the 12,000 guns in republic organizations? It is naive to think that all the owners of these weapons are inveterate huntsmen."

It is no problem to alter a gun and render it more accurate. Moreover, at one time hunting stores were allowed to sell converted, so to speak, 10-round Simonov semiautomatic carbines. Not far off submachineguns.

"What about submachineguns there?" V. Bayev, commodity expert for the network of republic hunting stores, joined in the discussion. "We carried out a raid once, we were looking for a small-bore gun, and found... a light and medium machinegun."

The world-renowned Kalashnikov submachinegun goes for R2,000 on the black market and people buy it.

"For self-defense," A. Kiryanov reckons, "for every eventuality... even for expensive guns, costing R500-700 each, they pay up to R100 on top."

But we are not blind or stupid, we know how frequent the attacks are on cooperative workers and workers from law-enforcement bodies, and ordinary armed robberies. First someone is shot, then someone defends themselves against the attackers.... And the best cadres are leaving the militia owing to low pay for such risky work.

In 1988 2,068 people in Kirghizia owned personal firearms, in 1990 this figure had risen to 2,280. These are clearly official figures. This figure could be considerably higher—demand exceeds supply. In this instance this eternal deficiency in the Soviet economy hardly needs criticizing.

Soviet Germans' Hold Rally in Alma-Ata

PM0901124390 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 9 Jan 90 Morning Edition p 1

[Own correspondent V. Ardayev dispatch: "Soviet Germans' Rally"]

[Text] Alma-Ata—On Sunday 7 January a sanctioned rally, in which over 500 people took part, was held at the Alma-Ata railroad workers' Palace of Culture after a show staged by the republic's German Drama Theater.

Labor veterans, representatives of the creative intelligentsia and informal organizations, and other citizens of German nationality who spoke at the rally expressed their great approval of the declaration adopted by the USSR Supreme Soviet in November, declaring to be unlawful and criminal all repressive actions against peoples subjected to forcible resettlement and restoring their rights.

At the same time, the participants in the rally expressed dissatisfaction at the inconsistency and half-heartedness of the actions taken to restore their real civil and human rights, particularly the right to return to the places from where the Soviet Germans were resettled in August 1941. In their opinion, the solution to the problem of recreating an autonomous republic for Volga Germans is being unjustifiably delayed.

Many people expressed great concern about the increased migration of Soviet Germans (mainly to the FRG), which exceeded 105,000 people in 1989 and, according to sociologists' predictions, may reach 1 million people over the next few years, which represents roughly half of the present Soviet German population. The speakers connected the increase in migration with the unsatisfactory solution of the problems of the German people in the USSR.

Speaking at the rally, representatives of Korean, Chechen-Ingush, Ukrainian, and Greek national cultural centers operating in Alma-Ata expressed their solidarity with the German public.

The participants in the rally adopted an appeal to the USSR Supreme Soviet.

Supreme Soviet Committees Resume Work

LD0901111990 Moscow Television Service in Russian 0330 GMT 9 Jan 90

[From the "120 Minutes" newscast]

[Text] The USSR Supreme Soviet committees and commissions have resumed their work. Most sessions will take place in Kalinin Prospekt in Moscow, which has been made available due to the abolition of several ministries. [video shows committee in session, with Boris Yeltsin at head of the discussion table]

Resignations Seen as CPSU 'Purification'

PM0901145490 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 6 Jan 90 First Edition p2

[Article by Lieutenant Colonel V. Tokarev, secretary of a unit political department party commission, under the rubric "Party Life. Subjects of Concern": "The People Being Swept Away by the 'Reflux'"]

[Text] The editorial mailbag represents a whole gamut of opinions on the future of restructuring and the party, the continued development of democracy and glasnost, and the role of communists in the life of society and the Armed Forces.

"The party has lost its authority.... 70 years have led nowhere.... Abolish Article 6 of the USSR Constitution.... The communists have ruined the country...." These certainly are sadly familiar statements, printed in yard-high letters in samizdat proclamations and creeping into the pages of the official press in slightly smaller print. The same ideas are trumpeted by "fighters for the people's happiness" at rallies and at the constituent congresses of all manner of fronts, movements, and unions. Similar phrases are used in radio and television broadcasts. Now people are surrendering their party membership cards....

The "reflux" from the CPSU is carrying away a fair mix of people. Dissenters who are "politically" motivated, people who are simply weak-willed and offended by some injustice, and temporary hangers-on who joined the party for selfish reasons and are now turning tail without so much as a backward glance are among those giving up their party membership cards. But apparently mature and sensible people, with solid party experience behind them, are doing the same, now confused and simply unsure of their ideals.

"I ask to be allowed to leave the CPSU. While considering myself a communist in my beliefs, I cannot be a member of the organization...." This request was sent by Captain O. Nesteruk to the party organization where Major V. Yermilov is secretary. It gave communists in the primary party organization and us members of the party commission attached to the unit political department something to think about. What was the worth of the phrase: "While considering myself a communist in my beliefs...?"

That was the starting point of the discussion at the party meeting. But it very soon became clear that the comrade simply had no beliefs at all. It was all a pose. He did not want to serve in the army, he had become disillusioned. He did not wish to be in the party, he wanted to become "independent in his opinions and actions." The communists rightly asked the question: While accusing the party of all the deadly sins under the sun, what had he himself done to strengthen its authority and establish a pure, honest image?

The officer fell silent. Indeed, what could someone who has received several party penalties say? He had interpreted his "vanguard" mission in an original way: He was a man who could allow himself to get behind the wheel of a vehicle while drunk. And he had committed serious oversights while on alert duty....

The meeting went on for a long time. Various assessments were made.

The discussion at the party commission session was no less difficult. I do not know what the former party member got out of it, but we bitterly learned a great deal ourselves. Here are just some extracts from the conversation.

"Tell us about the responsibilities of CPSU members. What do you disagree with in the Statute and Program?"

"I do not remember the whole Statute. You read it out to me and I will say...."

"Why did you join the party?"

"I was advised to at school. Anyway, I felt that it would be useful for advancement."

"Who recommended you?"

"I do not remember."

"Has your conduct lived up to the requirements of the CPSU Statute?"

"I did my service like everyone else."

"What about the party penalties?"

"That has nothing to do with it...."

Question after question, and, again and again, the results of past campaigns to "multiply" party ranks were plain for all to see.

Another example. Two communists, both captains, failed to appear for a party report session on time and subsequently handed in their membership cards. The reasons? The first said during a talk in the political department that "restructuring had opened his eyes to a great deal and so he did not see any point in staying in the party." The second was guided in his decision by a sense of injury at what he considered to be an unfair decision on a housing problem.

These are the kinds of arguments used. I deliberately have not given any names. I am convinced that these comrades are not the only ones to blame for the fact that doors have been slammed in one of the most dramatic periods for the CPSU. It is more likely our common misfortune.

We reap as we have sown, as they say. We will be frank: So often in the past we have been satisfied with pompous phrases like "I want to be in the front ranks of the conscious builders of communism" when admitting new members to the party. Or: "I dream of devoting my life to the great party cause." There really have been cases like these. Now we have the result—in the shape of yesterday's "conscious builders" and "dreamers" who are demonstratively handing in their membership cards. I will be frank and say that the party and all of us are paying a high price for the formal approach to the recruitment of new members and the pursuit of quantity rather than quality.

I do not think that a difficult problem can be resolved by any emergency measures: Either the purges suggested by some readers or more sociopolitical certification campaigns. We have done all this already—more than once. The CPSU's strength can only be restored and increased by substantial progress in the economic, ideological, and social spheres, which means active work by communists in this direction. The same applies to its intellectual, political, and, no less important, moral potential. We are pinning our best hopes on the forthcoming 28th congress.

The question of broad democratization of the party and its internal life is now on the agenda. This must be reflected in the new CPSU Statute. We really need a well considered, more up-to-date mechanism to give primary party organizations real rights to resolve the tasks facing collectives and, through communists, to influence the situation both in their own party organization and in the party as a whole.

I am convinced that Lenin's words "the party is the mind, the honor, and the conscience of our epoch" have not been dimmed because people with weak nerves and those who were simply hangers-on to the CPSU are now fleeing. Restructuring is putting everything in its place and speeding up the natural processes of purification and self-affirmation. This is evidenced by the new, fresh influx of party forces. This year, party organizations in our unit accepted 11 people as candidate members of the CPSU. Yes, this is fewer than in the past. But the approach now is quite different! Communists are more exacting toward those wishing to join the party. It is not simply the "attitude to restructuring" that is important, but the person's real participation in the renewal process. New members are admitted at open party meetings, on the basis of the opinions of the Komsomol and other social institutions. Members of the party commission also have an increased workload. People are responding to the questions raised by life not so much with words as with an active stand. We are gratified that Senior Lieutenant O. Kiselev, Senior Lieutenant N. Stolbovoy, Lieutenant V. Polyakov, and Senior Warrant Officer Yu. Karaulov have become candidate party members. They are men of deed and action.

New documents on people wanting to join the party lay on my work table. I picked up one of the applications: "I would like to be accepted as a candidate member of the CPSU. I realize that I am joining the party ranks at a difficult time. But I have made a conscious choice. I want to make a real contribution to restructuring...."

Can you feel the difference between this and what was written in similar cases just a few years ago? I would say that the distance is enormous.

CPSU Secretary Stroyev Tours Pskov, Novgorod

PM0901151690 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 8 Jan 90 Second Edition p 3

[TASS report: "Good Husbandry for an Ancient Land"]

[Text] Topical problems of renewing the countryside in the Russian Nonchernozem were the main topic during the tour by CPSU Central Committee Secretary Ye.S. Stroyev, who visited Pskov and Novgorod Oblasts 4-7 January.

During numerous meetings and talks with working people in the neighboring oblasts, there was a frank discussion of ways of accelerating the implementation of the Food Program, new ways of organizing labor, and the social restructuring of villages in this ancient Russian region.

In Pytalovskiy Rayon, the pioneer in the use of the lease system in Pskov Oblast, the main attention was devoted to an analysis of the results of work using various forms of contract. Experience shows that contractual relations promote a drastic increase in the efficiency of agricultural production and the resolution of many social and moral questions.

In Pskov the Central Committee secretary studied experience in the "conversion" of facilities that were under construction for a long time. For instance, in new shops that the land reclamation workers erected but were unable to use, the production of crackers, breakfast cereals, and chocolate and dairy confectionery is now being set up. The collective of the "Pervomayskaya" broiler unit is adapting an unused motor repair plant block for the production of poultry meat products.

The real potential for increasing meat and grain production and organizing the processing of agricultural products was the subject of a detailed discussion at the "Cherskiy" and "Kirov" Collective Farms [kolkhozes] in Palkinskiy Rayon. The "Kirov" Kolkhoz has valuable experience of building team centers: Original design solutions have enabled them to bring together under one roof, on the basis of "kinship," a medical center and a dispensary, and a small school and a kindergarten. Provision is made in the same buildings for housing for the farm's workers.

The CPSU Central Committee secretary inquired in detail about the introduction of new economic management methods on the farms and the use of efficient methods of organizing and paying for labor. It was noted that the oblast does not by any means make full use of reserves for increasing the production and sale of livestock products.

Ye.S. Stroyev began his visit to Novgorod Oblast with a visit to the "Leninskaya Iskra" Kolkhoz in Shimskiy Rayon. Milk yields here are over 3,000 kg per cow, while the leading milkmaids have crossed the 4,000 kg mark. The basis of this success is the firm feed base created by units operating on an economically accountable basis. Lease collectives engaged in raising young cattle have helped the "Leninskiy Put" Kolkhoz in Novgorodskiy Rayon to double sales of milk and meat to the state in the last 4 years. Both "Leninskaya Iskra" and "Leninskiy Put" show constant concern for people, build housing, and lay asphalt roads. All this helps to retain cadres in the countryside and enables the kolkhozes to be rejuvenated.

The CPSU Central Committee secretary drew attention to the need for in-depth work on introducing economic accountability in all sectors. Economic services and specialists must do painstaking work to reduce the prime cost of output and markedly increase the production and sale of milk and meat. Expanding the number of lease collectives and fattening livestock in kolkhoz members' yards could also be ways of achieving this.

At the Starorusskiy meat combine Ye.S. Stroyev studied the work of the collective, which is engaged in modernizing its enterprise. Here there has recently been a significant widening of the range of output produced, but not all the reserves are yet being utilized for improving the quality of goods and supplying them to local inhabitants.

Ye.S. Stroyev visited the shops of the Novgorod "Azot" Production Association named for the 50th anniversary of Great October. The enterprise is going through a difficult time now: The now chronic daily shortage of freightcars is holding back the growth of production. Workers spoke with concern about their enterprise's future and the social problems. There was a frank discussion of the role of Communists during the period of perestroyka, their lofty mission, and the continuity of the best traditions of party members, committed fighters for the cause of the working class and the whole people.

Ye.S. Stroyev had a meeting with members of the Pskov and Novgorod Oblast party committees and members of the oblast executive committees. They discussed improving the supply of food products to the population, particularly meat and milk, and ways of successfully implementing the decisions of the CPSU Central Committee March (1989) Plenum.

Theorists Debate Social Democratic Contribution

PM0901102990 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 5 Jan 90 Second Edition p 2

[Unattributed report: "Meeting of Scientists"]

[Text] A "roundtable" was held at the CPSU Central Committee Academy of Social Sciences 4 January on the topic "Communists and Social Democrats: The Socialist Idea and Practice from the Position of New Thinking."

In his introductory speech R.G. Yanovskiy, rector of the academy, emphasized the topicality of socialist theory for the processes of perestroyka and democratic renewal. All these phenomena are largely consonant with the article "The Socialist Idea and Revolutionary Perestroyka" published in PRAVDA.

The "roundtable" speakers pointed out that other dialectical processes attesting to complex new phenomena in social life, including the creation of new social democratic parties and movements, are occurring in the socialist countries' political practice.

RSFSR Supreme Court on Sentencing Policy

PM0901111590 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 5 Jan 90 Second Edition p 6

[Unattributed report: "RSFSR Supreme Court Plenum"]

[Text] A routine plenum of the RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic] Supreme Court has been held. It discussed the practice of imposing penalties not involving deprivation of liberty.

The report by V.I. Radchenko, first deputy chairman of the RSFSR Supreme Court, and speeches by plenum participants noted that, on the whole, the republic's courts correctly apply legislation regulating the practice of imposing the aforementioned types of penalty. There are considerable shortcomings and omissions, however.

When deciding the question of selecting a certain type of punishment, the courts do not always consider all the facts about the accused's character, which leads to the unfounded imposition of penalties not involving deprivation of liberty on habitual offenders and also persons leading an antisocial, parasitical lifestyle. In addition to this, sometimes sentences of confinement are unjustifiably imposed on people who have committed crimes not representing a great danger to the public and whose isolation from society is unnecessary.

In its resolution the plenum drew courts' attention to their duty to strictly observe the principle of individual punishment for every criminal case.

It is proposed that courts discuss—when there is justification for this—the question of imposing strict penalties, as stipulated by the law, on persons who have committed serious crimes, habitual offenders, and organizers of and active participants in criminal groups. At the same time, the plenum recommended that courts use the possibilities offered them by law with regard to imposing penalties not involving confinement on people who commit less dangerous crimes and who can be reformed without being isolated from society.

V.M. Lebedev, chairman of the RSFSR Supreme Court, chaired the plenum.

Leningrad Soviets Discuss Food, Supply Problem

LD0901142890 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1000 GMT 9 Jan 90

[Text] The problems of supplying the inhabitants of Leningrad with food and manufactured goods were discussed at a joint session of the oblast and city soviets of people's deputies. The participants of the session came to the conclusion that with the weakening of interregional links, first and foremost with the Baltic republics, it is necessary to introduce on a temporary basis in the city and in the oblast, a system selling individual types of goods on the basis of special identity cards [vizitnyye karty].

Scientific Cleanup Center Set Up Near Chernobyl

LD0901145890 Moscow TASS in English 1419 GMT 9 Jan 90

[Text] Kiev January 9 TASS—By TASS correspondent Aleksey Petrunya:

A new scientific and production association, Pripyat, has begun to function within the 30 kilometer zone around the Chernobyl nuclear power station.

The association, which has been established on the basis of the kombinat amalgamation, will more comprehensively and effectively tackle all problems conunected with clear-up operations following the 1986 accident at the Chernobyl nuclear power station.

Apart from production and economic activities within the zone, the collection, processing and dumping of radioactive wastes, the association will also handle the organisation and coordination of all research, international scientific and technical cooperation, testing and introduction of new technical means and decontamination procedures within the zone.

"It is the first time that a scientific and technological centre has been established to handle Chernobyl-related problems," Mikhail Sedov, general director of the new association, told TASS.

"A coordinating scientific and technical intersectoral council will function in order to avoid duplicating the activities of scientists and specialists and to raise the efficiency of their work.

"An international scientific centre is also being established. This initiative was supported by the international atomic energy agency and applications for particpation have already come from the companies of 26 countries and eight international organisations".

The Pripyat association will ensure more effective international, scientific and technical cooperation on Chernobyl problems. Original technologies and technical means are being developed in the Soviet Union to make it possible to decontaminate the affected territories in both stationary and mobile modes, Sedov said.

But it would be wrong to ignore world experience in this field and renounce technical means that are already available in the world, he added.

"For example, foreign firms have expressed a readiness to participate in the decontamination of the flood-plain of the Pripyat river where a large amount of radionuclides is concentrated.

"One of new tasks being handled by Pripyat is to give scientific and methodological assistance in work on contaminated territories of the Ukraine, Belorussia and the Russian Federation.

"A clean-up training centre is being established for Soviet personnel and foreign specialists to draw on the experience in clean-up operations following the Chernobyl disaster. "Training will be carried out in three main fields—decontamination, the handling of radioactive wastes, and practical dosimetry," Sedov said.

Chernobyl Victims Get Privilege Facilities

PM0901165190 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 8 Jan 90 Morning Edition p1

[Interview with A. Potapov, Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic Health Minister, by own correspondent R. Ignatyev under the heading "For Radiation Victims"—date and place unspecified; first paragraph is editorial introduction]

[Text] The Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic (RSFSR) Council of Ministers has adopted a decision on setting up special centers to help victims of the accident at the Chernobyl Nuclear Power Plant (AES). Our IZVESTIYA correspondent asked A. Potapov, RSFSR health minister, to comment on this document.

"First of all I would like to point out that these centers will be organized at medical establishments and sanatoria belonging to the former Fourth Main Administration under the RSFSR Ministry of Health and the Administration of Affairs of the RSFSR Council of Ministers. The 'Rossiya' Sanatorium in Yessentuki, the 'Arkhipo-Osipovka' Sanatorium in Krasnodar Kray, a boarding house with the same name, the 'Bimlyuk' Children's Sanatorium in Anapa, and the 'Yantarnyy Bereg' Sanatorium in Yurmala have been allocated for this purpose. Incidentally, these establishments are intended for the preventive treatment of adults and children living in RSFSR regions, and in Bryansk Oblast in particular.

"The necessary equipment is being installed in these sanatoria and boarding houses. Specialists are being taken on as staff. In short, everything is being done to provide qualified medical assistance for victims of the accident at the Chernobyl AES.

"The RSFSR Council of Ministers decision is essentially a continuation of the important work begun last year. In 1989 we were given several medical establishments and sanatoria previously belonging to the Administration of Affairs of the CPSU Central Committee, the Administration of Affairs of the RSFSR Council of Ministers, and the former Fourth Main Administration of the RSFSR Ministry of Health. They include the 'Goryachiy Klyuch' Sanatorium in Krasnodar Kray for the treatment of mothers and young children, three children's sanatoria in Anapa, a hospital in Klyazma, and the 'Kratovo' Sanatorium in Moscow Oblast. The 'Kratovo' treats children who were victims of the accident at the Chernobyl AES: they account for half of the patients there. A boarding house has been established at the 'Arkhipo-Osipovka' Leisure Center, where parents can go for a break with their children, and the consultation and diagnosis center of the republic children's clinic has now been set up at Clinic No. 3 in Moscow. The 'Krylatskoye' Leisure Center has also been made available for treating parents and their children. The children's clinic in Moscow, on Tsandera Street, has been handed over to us. A consultation and diagnosis center for giving assistance to young children from the capital's Dzerzhinskiy Rayon is now being established there. A rehabilitation and restorative treatment center for army personnel who served in Afghanistan has been opened at the 'Baykal' Sanatorium.

"They are planning to make more such establishments available in the future for organizing treatment and rest for the population."

Vlasov Views Kaliningrad Economic Autonomy

PM0901163190 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 8 Jan 90 Morning Edition p 2

[TASS correspondent V. Biryukov report: "Economic Autonomy the Aim"]

[Text] Kaliningrad, 6 Jan—Questions of organizing the implementation of the decisions of the Second Congress of USSR People's Deputies and 1990 plans for the economic and social development of Kaliningrad Oblast were discussed during a visit here by A.V. Vlasov, candidate member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and chairman of the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic [RSFSR] Council of Ministers. A great deal of attention was devoted to ensuring that the region functions reliably in the new economic management conditions. These subjects were discussed at virtually all the meetings on 3-6 January with party and soviet leaders, scientists and specialists, fishermen and workers, and agricultural working people.

It was stressed that in contemporary conditions it is fundamentally important to evolve a model of economic sovereignty for the region that will ensure its steady self-development. In this respect, the specifics of the territory and its place and role in the republic's national economy must be taken into account. As far as Kaliningrad Oblast is concerned, its main feature is its geographical situation: its remoteness from other Russian regions.

The need to give it greater autonomy is also dictated by new elements of its economic ties with the neighboring Baltic republics. Incidentally, this problem was raised repeatedly by participants in the conversations. It was pointed out that no serious changes are taking place in relations, but that people are concerned by the trend toward curtailing a whole series of previously well-established economic ties and limiting traditional trade.

In connection with the RSFSR's transition to self-financing in 1991, the region is seriously faced with the problem of independently providing many consumer goods, foodstuffs, and also construction materials.

Is the region up to this? Certainly. The oblast has fairly good starting points for transferring to self-management and self-financing, the chairman of the RSFSR Council of Ministers believes.

But giving the oblast autonomy is linked to the need to give it assistance as well. The fact is that for many years its budget has been drawn up without consideration for the features of this region, which is so important to the country. Many sectors of the national economy have been neglected as a result, and ecological problems have been aggravated. In particular, there is a serious need to strengthen the base of the local construction industry in order to scale down the practice of importing from afar those types of construction materials which have long been manufactured here.

The RSFSR Government will give the necessary assistance to the people of Kaliningrad Oblast in resolving these and other problems. However, they will have to do a great deal themselves, using available internal reserves. For example, when discussing the problems of enhancing the agroindustrial complex's efficiency and socially restructuring rural areas, people indicated the need to more boldly introduce progressive methods, such as the leasehold system and the organization of family-run farms, in addition to traditional methods. Large agricultural trade firms and combines that cover the full technological cycle—from cultivating agricultural produce to selling it—should be set up in order to improve the population's supply of vegetables.

Summing up the results at a meeting of Kaliningrad Oblast's party, soviet, and economic aktiv, A.V. Vlasov set specific tasks to accelerate and deepen economic reform in the region, improve the financial situation, and complete the drafting of a detailed program for transferring to self-management, self-financing, and maximum self-sufficiency.

During his visit to Kaliningrad Oblast the chairman of the RSFSR Council of Ministers visited the "Kvarts" Production Association, the "Primorskiy" Vegetable Cultivation State Farm, a number of other industrial and agricultural enterprises, construction projects, stores, and workers' canteens, and met naval personnel from the Twice Red Banner Baltic Fleet.

Government Views Mining Region's Development

PM0901120390 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian
4 Jan 90 Second Edition p 2

[TASS report: "Constructive Dialogue"]

[Text] The problems of introducing economic accountability and promoting the socioeconomic development of Kemerovo Oblast were discussed 2-3 January at a meeting at the USSR Council of Ministers.

Those invited included A.G. Melnikov, first secretary of Kemerovo Oblast CPSU Committee; A.F. Lyutenko, chairman of the oblast soviet executive committee; a group of USSR people's deputies from Kemerovo Oblast; and leaders of a number of USSR and Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic ministries and departments.

The attention of the meeting participants centered on the progress made in implementing USSR Council of Ministers Resolution No. 608 dated 3 August 1989.

L.A. Voronin, first deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers, presiding, announced that over the next few days the final amendments would be made to the program of economic recovery and for switching this mighty industrial region to economic accountability.

Leaders of ministries and departments answered questions put by representatives of the oblast's working people. It emerged in the course of the meeting that a number of fundamental questions have already been resolved and some of them are at the final stage of coordination. They include labor remuneration, hard-currency payments from foreign economic activity, the allocation of funds for a comprehensive ecological survey, finance for social programs, supplies, and others.

The meeting participants pointed out that working people's impatience and their desire to speed up the resolution of urgent problems were understandable. However, every question had had to be coordinated with a specific ministry or department, squared with the country's general development plans, and balanced with the decisions of the Second Congress of USSR People's Deputies. There were now no obstacles to the fulfillment of the plan, and a program on the Kuzbass would be adopted soon.

L.D. Ryabev, deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers, took part in the meeting's work.

Sharing their impressions of the meeting, the USSR people's deputies from the oblast stressed that the dialogue has moved fully to a constructive basis. This will produce tangible results. Work necessary to enable definitive documents to be adopted is currently under way on many individual problems and questions. The Kuzbass workers are not demanding any privileges on any position. Even when the entire plan is fulfilled the oblast will only reach the level of the mean indicators currently achieved in the Russian Federation.

Over the next few days the Kuzbass working people's representatives will meet with leaders and specialists from a number of ministries and departments to coordinate and amplify certain figures and indicators for the final ratification of the program for the oblast's socioeconomic development.

Consumer Goods Output to Rise By R66 Billion

LD0901143190 Moscow World Service in English 1200 GMT 9 Jan 90

[Text] Soviet output of consumer goods is to rise by R66 billion this year, that is four times the average in the past several years. The figure was quoted by Deputy Prime Minister Lev Voronin. That includes particularly high growth rates in the production of color television sets, record players, tape recorders, video tape recorders and other electronic equipment in various combinations. The social slant of the economy should help cope with the shortages and normalize the market. That will be aided by conversion of defense industries to produce consumer goods.

Vorotnikov Launches TV Program for RSFSR

PM0901155990

[Editorial Report] Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 7 January 1990 Second Edition carries on page 1 under the headline "SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA Television Program Launched" a feature on the 150-minute-long program "SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA Goes on the Air," due to be broadcast on Soviet All-Union Television's Channel 2 at 1430 on 7 January, which includes a "speech" by V.I. Vorotnikov, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and chairman of the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic [RSFSR] Supreme Soviet Presidium, entitled "Equality of Rights, Equality of Duties" and a synopsis of the program contents supplied by Vl. Kondakov. The Vorotnikov speech reads in full as follows:

"Esteemed television viewers, Central Television is today launching the broadcasting of a new television program called 'SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA.' I have been asked to address you on this occasion. First, I cordially congratulate the television viewers of the Russian Federation and all who view the new program today on this great, long-awaited event in the republic's political and cultural life.

"The Russian television program comes into operation at the start of the new year of 1990. This will be a difficult year for Russia and the whole country. Intensive work will be needed to carry out the economic recovery program and execute the other major decisions taken by the Second Congress of USSR People's Deputies. And, of course, the help afforded here by the mass media, above all television, is particularly substantial.

"What, then, are the tasks now facing the Russian Federation?

"In the economic sphere, for example, there are the problems of switching over to more effective and advanced methods of economic management. The task is to ensure that the Russian Republic masters these methods as quickly and successfully as possible and that economic accountability permeates every tier of our economic edifice from enterprises up to ministries and departments. But that is not all. Already this year a number of republic territories are switching over to principles of economic autonomy. It is clear that this is no easy task and requires long, multidimensional work. Economic ties have to be established within each territory and among territories, the concept of territorial economic accountability constantly refined at every enterprise, accumulated experience generalized, and the conditions for switching the entire Russian economy over to economic autonomy from 1991 then prepared.

"The upcoming election of people's deputies of the RSFSR and local soviets is a very important topic of political significance. Nomination of candidates has just been completed. Labor collectives and public organizations have nominated citizens whom they deem worthy and capable of carrying out state business in the republic, oblast, city, and village. The election campaign is just getting under way, and we hope that television will serve as a forum for voters and candidate deputies and will cover the elections in a businesslike, serious, but also accessible and interesting way.

"The power of television's impact on the masses is enormous, and I would stress therefore that those who are elected people's deputies and consequently how matters fare in the republic will depend to no small extent on its objective stance.

"But the elections are merely one stage in the great work of improving the political system and developing Russian statehood. The First Congress of RSFSR People's Deputies has to be held, many acute problems facing the republic legislatively resolved, and a new, bicameral Russian Federation Supreme Soviet elected. Local organs of power have to be formed and they will have a new look in many respects.

"As people know, a great event in the life of our republic's communists occurred in December: The CPSU Central Committee elected a Russian Bureau of the Central Committee which is to work directly with the party organizations of the krays, oblasts, and autonomous republics of the RSFSR. This involves a large array of tasks in all spheres of public life and, of course, the renewal of the party itself. All these questions should certainly be widely reflected on the Russian television program. I think that viewers will watch with interest broadcasts devoted to the Bureau's work, reporting on its sessions and the decisions taken. But the main thing, of course, is to show the creative activity of the Russian party organizations themselves at all levels and particularly the primary ones.

"The republic enters the new year with a renewed administrative-managerial structure. Conditions providing for the more effective solution of diverse tasks of political and socioeconomic development, the introduction of economic reform, and the democratization of state life have been created. A number of new ministries and departments needed for the proper management of all sectors of the national economy have been set up. The improvement of the structure of material-technical supply and the creation of a republic Academy of Sciences are next in line. I would like the new television program to pay constant attention to these question.

"A topic such as the state of national and interethnic relations in the Russian Federation should be specially dwelt on. Much has to be done to provide conditions for the all-around development of every Russian nation, the full exercise of their rights and opportunities, and for the ongoing development of the economy and culture of all autonomous republics, oblasts, and okrugs.

"We are faced with the task of carrying out the lofty principles formulated in the CPSU Platform on the Nationalities Question. This requires much painstaking work. It is essential to realize that the maintenance and strengthening of the union state is in accordance with the objective, long-term interests of all the Soviet peoples and that without this the stable, healthy development of relations between our country and other states is impossible. There is certainly no need to explain that Russia's contribution here is particularly important. It is essential that we do our utmost to safeguard and augment the friendship of the Soviet peoples and constantly supply the ideas of internationalism with new and real content.

"As is well known, the Communist Party and your state advocate further extension of the rights of all union republics and the strengthening of their sovereignty. In actuality this means that every one of them, including, naturally, the Russian Federation, must develop its economy on its own, chiefly through its own efforts. The nature of economic relations among the republics is also being defined more precisely, and they will be structured on the principles of equivalence, equality, and mutual benefit. This should stimulate maximum and at the same time rational utilization of individual regions. At the same time every republic forms part of the integrated economic organism and integrated national economic complex of the country. In developing its own economy it contributes to this complex, to the solution of statewide programs, and to the satisfaction of the overall needs of the Soviet people.

"It is clear that we are dealing here with problems that are to a certain extent new to us. And here too there is a mass of work for television and the other mass media. It is their paramount duty to study and disseminate the experience built up in this matter.

"I would like now to talk about the tasks facing us in the sphere of culture and education. Let no one reproach me for placing these questions virtually at the end of my speech. I merely wish thereby to stress that the activity of the institutions of the education system, science, culture, the creative unions and activity aimed at the spiritual development of society and promoting the elevation of the individual serve as a kind of common denominator of all the people's creative efforts. We are justly proud of our centuries-old culture. But this should not prevent our seeing that a mass of shortcomings and problems exists in the sphere of culture which need in-depth study and for which solutions need to be determined.

"I think that spiritual and moral problems are every bit as difficult, if not more difficult than economic ones. Many of us lack the level of knowledge and education and standard of human communication required. We have not learned how to listen to and heed our fellow speakers, and yet knowing how to empathize and sympathize and to be more tolerant and affable toward one another is so necessary now.

"It is clear, Comrades, that we can only fulfill all our plans in the economic, political, and cultural spheres through common, joint, concerted efforts. It is not possible for some to work while others are detached observers. Only labor—conscious, responsible, conscientious labor—will enable us to ensure perestroyka's success.

"In summing up all that has been said, I would like to stress the following. I hope that the SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA television program will serve not only as a means of informing the population of the RSFSR and the whole country about how Russians live and work. Its tasks are, of course, broader. It has to not only reflect the variety of everyday life in the republic but also help bring interests closer together, consolidate all the forces of society, and enrich its political, economic, and spiritual life with new ideas and new experience.

"That is why I would like Russian television journalists to maintain progressive, creative stances from the very outset in their difficult profession. Reporting on the republic, its people, and its problems should be truthful, and that means critical and incisive, but also well-considered, without lapsing into extremes. Not deviating from reality or distorting it, but explaining it in such a way that people's faith in the justice of our cause is strengthened. Not suppressing lamentable pages in our history but inspiring people by its best pages and outstanding traditions.

"It is clear that the television program, if it is to meet all these tasks, must enjoy the attention and support of the citizens of the republic. I hope that many of us will become its authors and permanent correspondents and will help the editorial office maintain a close link with every corner of our republic.

"I take this opportunity to wish all citizens of Russia, city and country dwellers, veterans and young people, all members of the multinational Russian family, and all television viewers success, health, and happiness."

Journalists Reminded of 'Moral' Demands

PM0901153190 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 6 Jan 90 Second Edition p 1

[Nikolay Demidov article under the "Plain Talk" rubric: "The Journalist's Ethics"]

[Text] Significant changes are now occurring in the world of newspapers, journals, radio, and television, just like in the other spheres of life. New publications are appearing, articles and journalists' statements are becoming bolder and more outspoken, there are opportunities to display creative abilities to the fullest and write about matters which used to be passed over in silence. Indeed, gifted people, the most principled and most honest, are advancing in editorial collectives. I do not think that there is any need to cite their names—they are, as the saying goes, on everyone's lips. They are actually the journalists who try to investigate thoroughly the complex and contradictory events of our time—to express their attitude to them and profoundly analyze the phenomena.

It may be said that there is no need to turn back to the style of editorial associates' work. Everyone is aware of the complexity and responsibility of their work. It would seem that demands on journalists have always been unambiguous: Professional skill, high standards of contact with readers and viewers, a clean moral image. But today's conversation is not in vain, and numerous letters received by PRAVDA prove this.

N. Kovynev, deputy chairman of the Uzbek Journalists Union Tashkent city organization presidium, wrote to us saying that now it is much more difficult to produce a newspaper or journal. It is indeed not easy to pass the daily test before readers in their thousands and millions in the conditions of glasnost and openness. Some publications have somehow lost their way in the unusual situation and have decided to attract attention by any means. Some started exposing anonymous bureaucrats of the pre-perestroyka period, others are banking on reprints of titillating reading matter extracted from dubious sources. Yet others revel in the subjects of eroticism, extraterrestrial forces, or miracle healing. Many letter writers simply complain that this kind of material is supplanting a businesslike discussion on the course of real perestroyka.

Let us put it in a different way. Very many statements have a somewhat tenuous association with a journalist's elementary ethics. I anticipate objections. Glasnost, some people will say, allows you to say everything that is on your mind, everything that perturbs you. True. But here is the important point: What is on your mind? If there are no serious thoughts or no clear knowledge of the topic of investigation, in-depth material can hardly be expected. So printed pages and broadcast programs start carrying trite and mediocre material and "sensationalist" articles which when checked out, prove to be nothing but soap bubbles.

A journalist has his official obligations, but he also has a moral duty to his audience involving a special inner state and—let me repeat this word—culture. Ethics.... What are we aiming to do, fellow writers? To help perestroyka, and therefore specific people? Or to "become famous" at all cost, to scare or to amuse the viewer and the reader just a little? You feel a sense of shame on seeing, for example, the "polemics" between publications which miss no opportunity to sting one another painfully. Subscribers are forced to join in the squabble and respond to materials whose objective is certainly not to conduct a debate but to try to prove themselves correct at any cost. We are—supposedly—the ultimate source of truth.

Yes, everyone has the right to express his opinion in the press. That opinion may be arguable. It is bad, however, when group interests or individual ambition gain the upper hand and divert attention from the day's urgent problems. It is even worse—and this, incidentally, is an increasingly widespread phenomenon—when there are conflicts within an editorial office itself. Almost every day brings complaints from journalists, especially those on local newspapers. We prepare materials on the basis of some of them, when the issue is worth it, but more often than not it is a question of settling accounts and trivial insults. Numerous squabbles develop out of nothing, for the simple reason that the standard of contacts is poor.

Exactly the same can be said about article writers. They are active assistants of staff journalists, and it is difficult to publish an issue without their participation. A tactful and attentive attitude to other people's manuscripts is another official duty of journalists, but ethics demands exactly the same attitude to the "stringers" themselves. Take the case of pensioner A. Bedritskiy, who wrote a note for the monthly TREZVOST I KULTURA. The material was accepted for print, and was subsequently... lost. The writer awaited publication for 30 months, worried about it, kept telephoning, called at the editorial office. Ultimately, the note was printed, but it did not contain a single line written by Bedritskiy.

...A genuine journalist will never compromise his conscience. His deeds and his intentions alike are pure. His main concern is to bring the truth to the people, to uphold justice, to defend perestroyka. Unfortunately, some newspapers are surrounded by people who offer their services for strictly personal considerations. There are frequent distortions of facts, superficial approaches to information analysis, and biased perceptions of reality. Now that the population's interest in the mass media has increased, these are impermissible.

Creative collectives in editorial offices are multifaceted and dissimilar. Each one of them has its own stance, signature, microclimate, and, if you like, its own image. They are successful to differing degrees. Nonetheless, there ought to be one element in common. Every journalist is duty bound to value the trust of readers, viewers, and listeners and to think of the response his words are likely to produce. This is made incumbent on us by our professional ethics. And by our professional duty.

PRAVDA Reviews KOMMUNIST January Issue

PM0901115390 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian
4 Jan 90 Second Edition p 3

[TASS report: "KOMMUNIST Published"]

[Text] "The main thing that worries and alarms me is society's attitude to labor..." Tadeush Pupkevich, USSR people's deputy, member of the country's Supreme Soviet, and driver of a walking excavator at the "Narvskiy" mine, notes in "Labor and Power," the opening interview in the first edition of KOMMUNIST this year. It is only by restoring the ties between labor, intellect, and power, he believes, that we can move off from the standstill. The periodical also summarizes its readers' opinions on this score by publishing a survey for the whole year. The essence of the journal's content clarifies the theme of a turning point in the existing situation and ways of achieving radical changes.

"How Should the Party Look: Two Viewpoints"—is the heading that unites materials that continue the discussion about the renewal of the CPSU. It is important to avoid spontaneous experimentation and dilettantism in our practical work in creating new institutions of power—this is the conclusion of A. Migranyan's article "Democracy in Theory and Historical Practice." I. Dementev writes about the need to analyze the psychology of national conflicts.

S. Golovnin and A. Shokhin's article is devoted to a real assessment of the scale of the black economy. V. Volkonskiy, author of the article "The 'Cultural Tradesman' Among Us," reflects on the restructuring of economic priorities.

The periodical publishes an editorial item entitled "In Memory of A.D. Sakharov."

The well-known British sociologist Theodore Shanin [name as transliterated] contributes a comment "Western Experience and the Danger of 'Inverse Stalinism.'"

Are restructuring processes possible without the intellectualization of social life? N. Keyzerov writes on this question and tries to find an answer to it in the article "Sword Dance in a Dark Room." In his article, Academician R. Petrov reflects on the new morality which corresponds to the realities of contemporary life.

The article by A. Bogaturov, M. Nosov, and K. Pleshakov "Who are Our Allies?", devoted to foreign policy aspects of perestroyka, continues the theme of the search for constructive solutions. The periodical publishes material presented to the editorial office by D. Khristofias, general secretary of the Restorative Party of the Working People of Cyprus Central Committee—"Soviet Perestroyka: The Cypriot Communists' Viewpoint." An article on Islam, a religion that fulfills the function of ideological, social, and cultural system for hundreds of millions of people in the world today, is worthy of note.

"Letters from the Country, 1937" are the historical documents carried in the first edition.

New Weekly Business Newspaper Published

LD0901142990 Moscow Television Service in Russian
0330 GMT 9 Jan 90

[From the"120 minutes" newscast]

[Summary] A new weekly business newspaper entitled KOMMERSANT has been published. The first issue came out today. It is aimed at businessmen and everyone interested in alternative economics. It will carry 16 to 20 pages of business-related news, including resolutions of the USSR Council of Ministers. It is on sale at newsstands and can be subscribed to.

Economic

Government Securities Program Detailed

PM0901110190 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian
4 Jan 90 Morning Edition p 1

[Own economic observer V. Romanyuk article: "Moscow: A Securities Market Being Created"]

[Text] The USSR Ministry of Finance has sent the government the last of a package of documents concerning the issue of securities in the country—draft conditions for the issue, sale, and redemption of targeted, non-interest yielding loans.

The first three documents—on the issue of state, targeted, non-interest yielding loans, the procedure for the distribution of USSR state treasury bills, and of the 1990 state internal 5% loan bonds—were adopted by the USSR Council of Ministers in 1989.

Describing the package as a whole, V. Rayevskiy, USSR deputy minister of finance, told me that with the adoption of these documents the USSR Ministry of Finance is concretely embarking on the implementation of a program to improve relations between the budget and the credit system. It is a question of creating real sources for eliminating the budget deficit. Whereas before the loan fund resources were simply levied and used as part of the budget, enterprise funds and working people's savings will now be involved on a mutually advantageous basis.

I asked S. Kuzicheva, deputy chief of the Procurement Department, how her first working day of 1990 started. It emerged that it began with a telephone call to the USSR Main Administration for Production of State Bank Notes, Coins, and Medals, where preparations for the issue of bonds and treasury bills are under way. Readers are probably most of all interested in the issue of state targeted non-interest yielding loans. The sum total of this loan is very "modest." Only R10 billion (to be redeemed in 1993). Bonds will be issued, each to the value of a specific article. These will include cars, motorcycle combinations, mini-tractors, color television sets, video-recorders, 2- and 3-compartment refrigerators, microwave owens, washing machines, and personal computers. The bonds will be redeemed with these goods. They are to be distributed via labor collectives and local soviets. It has been taken into account that the prices of these articles may change: If there is a price rise, the additional sum of money will have to be paid, if the price drops, people will receive the difference between the value of the bond and the price of the article. The goods involved are progressive, technically sophisticated goods, and therefore special responsibility falls to the sectors and enterprises which are to take on the production of these goods.

The purpose for which the funds obtained from the sale of USSR state treasury bills are to be used is different. Incidentally, they are being issued for the first time in our country. And they will be distributed through branches of the USSR Savings Bank which will pay out income out of the annual 5% interest in exchange for coupons. Does this mean that we will be "cutting out coupons"? Quite right, once a year—and there are 16 coupons in all.

Treasury bills will be issued in denominations from R50 to R1,000. The state intends to use the billions of rubles obtained in this way primarily to redeem the state loans of 1954-1956. This is particularly important in order to restore in principle the population's confidence in state loans. Incidentally, this manner of depositing money is attractive also because state treasury bills can be used as collateral if you suddenly need cash and have to take out a loan.

And finally, about the 1990 state internal 5% loan. Its purpose is known—to cover the R60 billion budget deficit. Only enterprises and organizations will be able to acquire these bonds, whose value will range from R10,000 to R1 million. Income from them will be added to the profits of the enterprises which acquire them, and this will be done exclusively on a cashless basis. At present enterprises receive only 0.5% of annual interest on their remaining cash funds deposited in banks. Investment of funds in bonds increases this income 10-fold! Let us bear in mind that enterprises and organizations currently have some R100 million in their accounts.

I must also say something about what all these loans have in common. Above all, they will be distributed on a purely voluntary basis. This in itself demands the creation of terms which are advantageous for all. Some of them we have already mentioned. There are others, too. For instance, owners of the 5% internal bonds will be able to resell them through banks to other enterprises, organizations, or credit institutions. However, in respect of how the new money circulation mechanism will function in the country the picture is not yet absolutely clear.

I have not been able to actually lay my hands on the new securities; so far only dummies exist. According to the Ministry of Finance, it is a matter of a few weeks. So you can see that the question of the creation of a securities market is being placed on the agenda in the most practical form.

Short-Term Economic Recovery Measures Outlined

PM1001094090 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian
9 Jan 90 Morning Edition p 1

[IZVESTIYA economic observer V. Romanyuk article: "State Planning Committee [Gosplan] Proposes, Government Disposes"]

[Text] In an interview for IZVESTIYA (No 3 for 1990), Yu.D. Maslyukov, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo, first deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers, and chairman of the USSR Gosplan, mentioned a whole package of economic recovery measures that are to be adopted, the preparation of which is to be carried out in literally a matter of days.

Here is the first news: The USSR Gosplan has submitted to the government for examination a draft resolution on the introduction from January 1990 of additional economic sanctions for failing to accept or to fulfill state orders. The crux of the problem is that enterprises' rights have been considerably extended, but certain collectives have not made the best use of the freedom granted to them: They have begun to reduce deliveries of many cheap consumer goods to the consumer market. Instances of failing to fulfill or even refusing to accept state orders have become more frequent, leading to a sharp deterioration in material and technical supplies to whole sectors.

This is how it is proposed to rectify the situation. If it is a question of output and agricultural raw materials going into all-union stocks, on the basis of the results of the quarter the enterprises in question will be allocated reduced deliveries of centrally distributed resources. These resources can be sold promptly on the world market—to buy the articles that are in short supply. On the part of banking institutions, it is proposed to increase by 50% the interest rate on credit for any purpose granted to enterprises that violate state orders. Sanctions of the same kind will be adopted with regard to affiliated enterprises.

These proposals were examined at a USSR Council of Ministers Presidium session the other day. It was decided to come back to the question on 12 January and adopt a final decision. We will inform readers on the positions that are eventually enshrined in the government resolution.

The USSR Gosplan also sent the government a draft plan for certain urgent measures to normalize money circulation. It is proposed that banking institutions, including commercial banks, issue cash to cooperatives only for labor payments, official expenses, and purchases of produce from the population. Institutions of the USSR Savings Bank are excluded from providing credit and account services to cooperatives. It is planned to formulate a provision on the procedure for auction sales of essential goods, as well as a draft resolution on auction sales of goods for industrial and technical purposes and on the distribution of profit obtained by this means.

Please note: We have only mentioned the points that it is planned to implement by 10 January 1990. Looking a little further ahead, we find in the program measures to organize the sale to the population of the housing area they occupy in apartment blocks in the state housing stock and the housing stock of enterprises, the long-term leasing of land plots to the urban population for dacha, orchard, and garden construction (with payments based on land survey valuations), and the acceleration of the preparation of interest-free marketable loan bonds for realization in the first quarter of 1990 for a sum of not less than R3 billion.

But let us not run on ahead. Let us note one more decision: A number of central economic departments are instructed to present to the USSR Council of Ministers—for submission to the Supreme Soviet—proposals on amendments to the USSR Law on the Cooperative System aimed at eliminating negative processes in the cooperative movement.

Export Goods Requiring License Listed

PM2912113189 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 28 Dec 89 Morning Edition p 2

[Unattributed report: "Licensing Export of Goods"]

[Text] In execution of the USSR Supreme Soviet 20 November 1989 resolution "on additional measures to stabilize the consumer market and step up state control over prices," the USSR Council of Ministers on 11 December published Resolution No 1104 "on additional measures for the state regulation of foreign economic activity in 1990," which has established that, in carrying out all types of foreign economic activity (including direct production and scientific and technical ties, offshore and border trade and commodity exchange—barter—operations), in cases of the export and import of goods subject to license, enterprises, associations, and organizations sign agreements (contracts) and dispatch output abroad only after receiving the relevant licenses from organs empowered to do this.

Modifying in part and supplementing the list of output whose export is subject to license in accordance with the USSR Council of Ministers 7 March 1989 Resolution No 203, for 1990 the licensing of the export of the following consumer goods and the raw material for their production is introduced:

Vodka and other liquor, wine (including sparkling wine), wine materials, cotton textiles (including unbleached textiles), linen textiles (including unbleached textiles), woolen textiles, leather footwear, sewn articles, knitwear, hosiery, refrigerators and freezers, washing machines, vacuum cleaners, domestic sewing machines, electric meat grinders, electric irons, electric coffee grinders, air conditioners, television sets, radio receivers, clocks and watches, cameras and movie cameras, bicycles, motor cycles, passenger automobiles, carpets, linoleum, glazed ceramic wall tiles, ceramic sanitary ware, baths, radiators, convector heaters, slate, shatterproof triple glass (triplex), mixer taps, sinks and washbasins, light cables, synthetic fibers, artificial fibers, synthetic yarns, artificial yarns, cotton, cotton yarn, raw silk, hemp fiber, large untanned hides, small untanned hides, untanned pigskin, leather goods, wool combings, and horses for meat.

Here licenses for these types of goods are issued by the USSR Ministry of Foreign Economic Relations.

Alongside goods in this list, in accordance with the 7 March 1989 Resolution No 203 the USSR Ministry of Foreign Economic Relations licenses flour, vegetable oils, animal food fats (including butter), sugar, meat and meat products, milk and dairy products, flax fiber, natural wool, down and untreated furs, the USSR Ministry of the Fish Industry licenses fish and fish products (excluding fish from internal waters, except for sturgeon), and the union republic councils of ministers license fish from internal waters, except for sturgeon.

At the same time, there is a ban on the export, through trade exchange (barter) operations, offshore and border trade, and direct ties, of foods, coal, petroleum products, timber materials, fertilizers, construction materials and sanitary ware earmarked for sale to the population in excess of the quantities stipulated for these purposes by the State Plan for the Economic and Social Development of the USSR for 1990 and the above-mentioned 11 December 1989 Resolution No 1104.

In connection with the abolition of the USSR Ministry of the Construction Materials Industry, the "Soyuzstroymaterialov" state association has been instructed (in partial modification of the USSR Council of Ministers 7

March 1989 Resolution No 203) to issue licenses for the export of the relevant output.

Retail Gold Prices To Increase 50 Percent

PM0901135790 Moscow KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA in Russian 9 Jan 90 p 1

[Unattributed report: "Gold Prices Rise"]

[Text] The USSR Council of Ministers has adopted the decision to raise as of 10 January 1990 the level of retail prices for jewelry and articles made from precious metals by an average of 50%. Prices for precious metals bought from the population are to rise by the same amount.

The additional revenue will be channeled into financing social programs planned for 1990.

Aviation News Conference Views Future Plans

LD0901230990 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1530 GMT 9 Jan 89

[Text] Moscow, 9 Jan (TASS)—TASS correspondent Yuriy Kozmin writes:

The issue of increasing the production of civilian aircraft through conversion was a principal one at a news conference which today took place at the USSR Ministry of Aviation Industry [Minaviaprom].

"The 20% reduction in military orders this year opens up real possibilities for increasing the manufacture of new-generation civilian aircraft, such as the Il-96-300, Tu-294 and Il-114, and expanding the volume of design work," said Aleksandr Batkov, head of the USSR Minaviaprom Main Administration for Future Scientific Studies, speaking to the journalists. He noted that now conversion in the sector was directed not so much at meeting the requirements of Aeroflot as at the development of equipment for the light and food industries and for agriculture.

Aleksandr Aksenov, USSR Deputy Minister of Civil Aviation, spoke at the news conference and noted that the bringing of new types of aircraft into operation could be delayed because it was planned to install in them fundamentally new air navigation systems and new-generation engines.

The volume of freight and passengers carried grows every year. To eliminate problems arising for this increase experts believe that other solutions are necessary—for instance, leasing of aircraft manufactured by foreign companies. To this end, it is proposed to lease in the immediate future five A-310 planes manufactured by the international consortium Airbus Industries and to operate them both on domestic and on international air routes.

Cost, Access to Abolished Medical Unit Viewed

90US0260A Moscow ARGUMENTY I FAKTY in Russian No 48, 2-8 Dec 89 pp 4-5

[Interview with Yu. Tsavro, member of the USSR Supreme Soviet Commission on Privileges, by correspondents V. Romanenko and A. Uglanov: "The Fourth Administration Has Been Abolished. But What Next?"; date and place not given]

[Text] **A significant portion of the ARGUMENTY I FAKTY mail comprises questions on social justice and privileges of the apparatus of the country's organs of state administration. Many readers indicate directly that this is not a social, but a political issue, and that in many ways, the fate of perestroyka also depends upon its resolution. On 12 November, the USSR Council of Ministers adopted Decree No 886 on the abolition of the Fourth Administration under the USSR Ministry of Health. A commission headed by A.P. Biryukova was created and charged with carrying out the transfer of the section of the treatment and recovery institutions to the general medical network. A treatment and recovery association is being created under the USSR Council of Ministers.**

USSR Supreme Soviet Commission member Yu. Tsavro responds to our correspondents' questions.

[Correspondents] Yuriy Stanislavovich, what was the budget of the Fourth Administration like?

[Tsavro] There is little chance that any of the deputies would answer your question today. But I think that this was a very large amount. For example, according to the official information, the sanatorium-resort system of the 4th Administration of the USSR Ministry of Health comprised 19 sanatoria, rest homes, and one steamship, the "Lev Tolstoy." They had basic funds of R320 million. On an annual basis, their upkeep cost health care R37 million.

Children's sanatoriums which had already been transferred to extra-departmental health care were not included in this list; the children of the leaders of the Soviet and party apparatus rested there. For example, the entire annual supply of sturgeon, and of other delicacies for the city of Yevpatoriya went to the provision of such a children's sanatorium, the "Brigantin."

[Correspondents] And was that all that the sanatorium-resort system of the 4th Main Administration under the USSR Ministry of Health had at its disposal?

[Tsavro] The official answer is yes. Yet it should be remembered that there are corresponding 4th Main Administrations under all the republic Ministries of Health. Moreover, along with these there exist, for example, sanatoriums such as "Parus" for the trade unions' highest elite. In 1989 there opened within the territory of the "Artek" pioneer camp the 100-place "Ayu-dag" rest home for Komsomol Central Committee staffers; it cost R2.5 million. Its former denomination, "For Komsomol Central Committee Staffers" has now been changed immediately to "For Receiving Foreign Delegations."

[Correspondents] What will come after you have finally worked out your recommendations? Will they be placed on the agenda for the session?

[Tsavro] No. Our commission was created by the decision of the Congress of People's Deputies, and must report to the 2nd Congress on the advantages and privileges held by the apparatus of the organs of state administration. We must also understand the usurped, illegal advantages.

The very system of privileges is faulty, and in our society it has taken on the nature of perversion and abuse.

[Correspondents] Tell us, are Shchelokov's relatives still being treated within the 4th Administration?

[Tsavro] I think so. Like all "formers" who have gone on pensions for "reasons of health," and their children and grandchildren. But these are very intricate questions. And apparently, they remain to be gone into not only by our commission.

[Correspondents] Nowadays, everybody is talking about single-use syringes, or rather, the lack of them. People were shaken by the tragedy in Elista. Was the 4th Main Administration of the Ministry of Health provided with them?

[Tsavro] Only single-use syringes have been used there for a long time now. But this not by any means the best of what they had. In the USSR Ministry of Health, one of the deputy ministers, a Collegium member, concerns himself with issues of sending seriously ill patients abroad for treatment. Who are these patients? I am a doctor myself, and none of my patients has ever undergone such treatment. Do you know how much an operation costs abroad...

[Correspondents] And have the privileges commission chairman and members used the services of this administration?

[Tsavro] All the people's deputies had this opportunity. We were registered in the system.

[Correspondents] But none of you objected to this?

[Tsavro] Of course there were those who objected. Certain deputies, however, vacationed in the administration's sanatoriums this year, and were very satisfied. Yet I do not think that we should strive toward a leveling—that is not the sense of the elimination of the administration. At present, incidentally, during the winter, up to 70% of those in the party sanatoriums are worker-communists.

[Correspondents] What other privileges have come into your commission's field of vision?

[Tsavro] The issue of the so-called "personal automobiles" was raised. I think that the Council of Ministers will make a sensible decision on this.

Personal pensions were also discussed. A great deal of work faces us here; it is a complex issue.

We have created several subcommissions, including one for personal pensions. There is a subcommission for transportation, for everyday services, etc. For example, to this day there are special warehouses, tailoring workshops... But investigation is not part of the commission's function. We must understand the causes which generated this phenomenon.

The food cost for one day in hospital Number 51, Kievskiy Rayon, Moscow—1 ruble 53 kopeks; in the associated hospital of the 4th Main Administration, from 3 to 9 rubles, depending upon rank. The menu, hospital Number 51, Kievskiy rayon, Moscow: breakfast: milk porridge, tea, butter, egg. Late breakfast: milk or apple. Lunch: pea soup, buckwheat kasha, compote. Supper: rolled oat kasha, tea.

Lunch	Output	Protein	Fat	Carbohydrates	Calories
Lemon salmon	40/10	8	4	—	68
Carbonnade	50	10	6	—	94
Carrot-raisin salad, sour cream	85/15	1	3	14	84
Fresh vegetables	100	1	—	3	15
I					
Bullion, dumplings	300/20	4	8	13	129
Vegetable soup	400	2	8	12	125
Vegetarian borshch	400	4	9	27	198
Green shchi, egg	400	6	11	20	198
Cream of carrot soup	300	6	9	26	203
Cream of buckwheat soup	400	10	15	33	299
II					
Baked pikeperch, potatoes, sauce	240	21	12	30	305

Lunch	Output	Protein	Fat	Carbohydrates	Calories
Brussels beef	80	22	12	—	196
Roast meat	70	17	6	—	122
Baked chopped steak	100	16	11	7	189
Sides:					
Mashed potatoes	150	3	4	27	194
Assorted vegetables	150	4	4	19	123
•					
Fish vegetable soup	150	6	12	10	170
Carrot apple puff	150	5	4	20	131
III					
Fresh fruit compote	200	—	—	23	86
Cranberry kisel	200	—	—	23	86

Economic Aspects of Ship Scrapping Discussed

PM1001134390 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian
9 Jan 90 Second Edition p 8

[Report by V. Nesterenko under the rubric "Top Secret!": "Destroyer for Sale"]

[Text] Leningrad—I approached the symbolic counter—the Leningrad Naval Base equipment depot. Its chief, retired Rear Admiral I. Galustov, leafed through the documents, calling out figures and dates:

"On 3 November we sold two destroyers abroad. Two patrol escorts as well, and we are preparing two submarines for sale.... No, we do not have trade contacts with foreign firms ourselves. That is the job of the Moscow organizations 'Inmet' and 'Eksportflot'."

I asked about the fate of the cruiser which had gotten me onto the subject in the first place. I received the following answer: No, the *Oktyabrskaya Revolyutsiya* has not been sold for scrap like the aforementioned destroyers and submarines. The rear admiral admitted that he did not know for sure, but it appears that veterans, all who had served on the cruiser, had protested. So the ship had been sold to the Soviet "Vtorchermet" organization.

I went to the outskirts of the city, to a remote corner of the Turukhtannyye Islands, and on the way I recalled a conversation with the former commander of the *Oktyabrskaya Revolyutsiya* and a former senior officer. The two seamen independently described as hasty the action of those who gave the order to write the warship off. Of course, the warship was certainly old, having been at sea for a little over 30 years. But still it did not add up: The *Oktyabrskaya Revolyutsiya* for sale? I told the former commander about it. He made me even more perplexed:

"Old warships usually serve until they breathe their last: At the end of their lives they are used as targets."

The gate bore a sign: "Vtorchermet. Ship-cutting shop." What a name: like "fish-cutting" or "meat-cutting"...

I went to the last berth. There was the cruiser, which "Vtorchermet" has now been toiling over for 2 years.

"The problem is," one of the "ship-cutting" workers readily explained, "that 'Vtorchermet' is not equipped to work on big ships. We have nothing to cut them with. The only 100-tonne crane with hydraulic cutters for the whole region is West German-made."

And another problem—all this work is ecologically harmful. Our country does not have a special port to deal with old ships that have been written off. "Vtorchermet" has no particular desire to "roast" warships before they go to the furnace. The ship owners, like the seamen, are aware of the "Vtorchermet" people's antipathy.

That is why people in the know have said that in order not to get involved in any complicated procedures they would take the ship out into deep water and quietly open the Kingston valves. It is easier to sink a ship, apparently, than to prevail upon "Vtorchermet."

This means that raw material which the FRG, for example, is now buying from us at the rate of $100 per tonne would go to the bottom.

A journalist colleague showed me an official letter from a Netherlands firm: The world market, it says, will pay hard currency for scrap.

"We are selling scrap from former destroyers and submarines to foreigners at the rate of $1 per unit of weight," V. Voznyak, general director of the Leningrad "Vtorchermet," said. "Then, when items made from it return to us in the form of imported purchases, we pay $20 for the same weight."

Apparently, there is a firm in Spain that does this. That is why foreign firms, for example, in the Baltic countries, are keen to buy old ships from us—at $100 per tonne! The civilian sector—cooperatives—also has come to understand the situation in Kronshtadt. At the rayon soviet executive committee the writer of this piece was told: There is a cooperative that is preparing to raise ships and then sell them abroad as scrap.

So we have a great deal of metal and foreign currency if we squander our own raw material and financial resources. [sentence as published] As for the resourceful cooperative workers, the Leningrad City Soviet Executive Committee must think hard about what the Kronshtadt "Albatross" cooperative is doing and planning.

Finally, the *Oktyabrskaya Revolyutsiya*: It was not handled in the best possible way, its former commander, Captain First Class N. Novozhilov, reckons. If it had been refitted, the cruiser could still be serving at sea. Alas, it is in the "ship-cutting" shop. But not even the blast furnaces are benefiting: The 100-tonne crane is undergoing repairs again.

Railway Problems Affect Cities' Drinking Water

LD0901151590 Helsinki Domestic Service in Finnish 1400 GMT 9 Jan 90

[Text] The Soviet Union's faltering rail deliveries are endangering the cleansing of several cities' drinking water. In Tallinn, at least, the chemical coagulant used to clean drinking water is running out, and the situation is alarming. Half the city's residents, some 200,000 people, get their drinking water from the surface water of the nearby Ulemiste Lake. If the train bringing the cleansing chemical does not arrive in Tallinn in a couple of days, households will have to boil both drinking water and milk. Without coagulant, the bacteria in the surface water does not precipitate away, nor will mere chlorination make the water drinkable. According to Estonian Minister of Health Laur Karu, similar cleansing problems are threatening Riga and Leningrad:

[Begin Karu recording in English] Yes, and the same problem is now in Riga and Leningrad, and Tallinn, because we all get coagulant from Rostov. [end recording]

Leningrad, Riga, and Tallinn get coagulant by rail from Rostov, near the area of Armenian and Azerbaijani unrest. Minister of Health Laur Karu also says that Estonia intends to establish its own coagulant production so that clean drinking water can be guaranteed in the future.

Boost in Economy Called for in 'Crucial Year'

PM0901104790

[Editorial Report] Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 5 January 1990 Second Edition carries on page 1 under the rubric "How We Are Beginning the Year" a collection of three reports on problems being encountered at plants in Estonia, the Tatar Autonomous Soviet Socialist Republic, and Kuybyshev. The reports say there is a need to adhere rigidly to state standards, instructions from above, and the state plan. These are followed by a commentary attributed to the "Economic Policy Department":

"The first working week of the new year of 1990 is not yet over, but alarming telegrams and letters from many places are falling onto PRAVDA's editorial desks. At one station raw materials are not being unloaded from railroad trains in good time; in another city preparations had not been made for the frosts which suddenly descended—and this too upsets the labor rhythm; in a third it is reported that people leave their shops to attend a rally.

"And the workdays of the new year are flying by irrepressibly. Who is going to substantially increase for us this year the production of the consumer goods and foodstuffs that we are so acutely short of? Who is going to urgently complete the construction of the housing, hospitals, and children's establishments for which construction workers failed to meet the commissioning targets last year?

"Let us make more vigorous progress, dear Comrades, from talk about perestroyka to practical, creative action. Our people pin considerable hopes on 1990, which is rightly regarded as a crucial year. And they are perfectly valid, these hopes. We possess a very rich intellectual and labor potential, considerable natural resources, and experience of economic management under conditions of radical reform.

"In short, we are capable of shouldering a big burden. Everything will now be determined by the standard of practical organizational work. There is no time to delay. Communists must be in the vanguard of creative undertakings in every sector of management.

"This year, now that the Second Congress of USSR People's Deputies has approved the government program for improving the national economy, which is aimed at improving the people's life, it is essential to pursue practical matters more vigorously. There must not be a single hour's delay!" the commentary concludes.

Scientific

Cosmonauts Complete Eighth Scheduled Space Walk

Program Outlined

LD0901113590 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 0315 GMT 9 Jan 90

[Report by Vladimir Bezyayev]

[Excerpt] [Passage omitted] [Bezyayev] Well, in connection with the fact that there was a holdup launching the Kvant-2 module, the program has shifted somewhat, but the essentials have not changed. They are to make another three or four space walks and during the next one they are toremove the samples that were left on the surface of the station during the last walk. Incidentally, preparations have been very lengthy. It has been a whole year since anyone went into open space. The last to do so were Jean-Luc Cretien and Aleksandr Volkov during the joint Soviet-French flight.

So, during the next walk, those samples that are eagerly awaited by the French specialists are to be taken down. Then, beginning with the third walk, they will be going out via a new lock chamber. It's on the new Kvant-2 module. And that's where the flying chair or space motorbike or autonomous means of movement for the cosmonauts is, of which a great deal is expected. This is the sort of device which will aid in the building of future space stations. It will be possible to carry out repair and rescue work. In short, it is the prototype for movement in space in the future.

8 Jan Space Walk Described

LD0901145290 Moscow World Service in English 0910 GMT 9 Jan 90

[Text] Soviet Cosmonauts Aleksandr Viktorenko and Aleksandr Serebrov who have been working on board the Mir long-term orbital complex for 4 months have carried out experiments in raw space. A report from our correspondent.

Despite the late-night hours, many scientists, cosmonauts, and specialists gathered at mission control. This happens when crucial operations take place and one such operation is a walk in raw space. So far cosmonauts had left Mir on seven occasions, having worked a total of 27 hours 35 minutes outside their star home. And then came the eighth walk. For the current crew of Aleksandr Viktorenko and Aleksandr Serebrov it was the first one. How did events develop in orbit this time?

The crew put on their protective spacesuits, checked the hermetity [as heard] of the hatches, opened them and floated outside not with a light luggage but with two massive star sensors weighing 80 kg each. Even in weightlessness the load is very inconvenient. They had to walk along the Mir hull to the place where the sensors were to be installed. At that time flight engineer Aleksandr Serebrov reported to ground controllers that they had walked out of the earth's shadow and could see the sun. It became completely light. Now the solar battery began to turn its head and made it easy for the crew to walk toward the place where the devices were to be installed. And, judging by the men's cheerful voices, everything was all right in orbit. Then Mir was out of contact for Soviet radar stations and we were unable to hear how the most crucial operations proceeded in raw space. But when contact was restored the cosmonauts reported that they had placed the star sensors outside the station. The devices are designed for the complex's orientation by stars. The new 20-ton Kvant-2 module docked with Mir recently and the complex took the shape of the letter 'L' so it required new instruments to steer this construciton in space accurately.

On their way back to the station Viktorenko and Serebrov lifted from its external panels samples of various materials left in outer space during a Soviet-French flight in 1988. Experts spoke highly of the crew's performance. At the final stage of the experiment the crew were in radio contact with Valeriy Ryumin, a veteran cosmonaut who is now one of the officials in charge of the Soviet space program. Ryumin congratulated both cosmonauts on their first walk in raw space. The commander, Aleksandr Viktorenko, thanked him and said that they had completed all the operations. Asked how they felt, the crew said they were okay and did not feel tired. Aleksandr Viktorenko and Aleksandr Serebrov spent a total of 3 hours in raw space. Before the completion of their flight in mid-February they are to make another four walks in raw space.

Delay Due to Faulty Valve Explained

LD0901232590

[Editorial Report] Moscow Television Service in Russian at 1800 GMT on 9 January, in its "Vremya" newscast, carries a 3-minute video report by S. Slipchenko giving details of the 8 January space walk by Aleksandr Vitorenko and Aleksandr Serebrov. The video opens with a drawing illustrating the route which the cosmonauts had to take carrying two 80kg stellar sensors. More than 4 hours were allotted for the round trip, but the cosmonauts opened the hatch almost an hour later than planned. Shots of flight control center staff are shown, then Slipchenko is seen seated with V.D. Blagov, deputy flight leader, whom he asks to explain the delay. Blagov says: "As pressure was being released from the space between the hatches, we saw that pressure was falling practically simultaneously from the living quarters of 'Soyuz,' which meant unambiguously that somewhere a valve was not shut. We found this valve. It was not shut. This was due to an error in the crew's work and insufficiently rigorous monitoring from earth. The guilt here should probably be divided between both sides."

He goes on to say that over many years of cosmonautics the practice has been established of following up and getting down to the essentials in such cases—not in order to issue reprimands, but to gain a full picture of the event in question so that it can be more easily countered in the future. He says the cosmonauts caught up with the schedule and completed their extravehicular activity practically within the time which had been planned.

Slipchenko asks Blagov what marks he would give the crew. Blagov replies: "I wouldn't give them, nor earth, five, because of what I said earlier, but probably four out of five inasmuch as the task was of course completed. The sensors are in position. All-in-all, four."

The accompanying video shows various shots of flight control center staff and the main flight path screen, and diagrams of the space craft. A screen reads: "Actual time spent in space: 02:56:00." Another diagram of the space craft is entitled "Scheme for the Location of Equipment."

Austrian Spaceflight Candidates Begin Training

LD0901150990 Moscow TASS in English 1448 GMT 9 Jan 90

[Text] Moscow January 9 TASS—By TASS Correspondent Rena Kuznetsova:

Austrian candidates for a Soviet-Austrian space mission aboard the orbiting Mir station began their training today at the Zvezdny cosmonaut training center.

Physician Clemens Lothaller and Engineer Franz Vienboeck visited the linguaphone room, as they will spend the next three weeks studying Russian.

After that they will prepare for the flight. One of the two candidates will participate in the mission in 1991.

Japanese and British cosmonauts are already training for international space missions at the Soviet center, which houses modern laboratories, trainers, gyms, a planetarium and a hydraulic pool, where cosmonauts train for the space walk.